

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: parinirvana on DW

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...It was either him or greg, one of them had to go...

Sherab Dorje said:

Neither of us had to go, he decided to leave because he felt that he was being unduly discriminated against by staff and that I was being pandered to.

When in doubt, blame everybody else!

Personally, I am unhappy that he left, because some of the stuff he posted was genuinely interesting and informative (regardless of whether I agreed with all of it or not).

PS As an ex-staff member I don't have any executive power/capacity. I, when needed to, have recourse to reporting posts, just like any other member.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am familiar with the charge, having been subjected to it many times myself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: parinirvana on DW

Content:

tatpurusa said:

What happened to padma norbu?

Malcolm wrote:

He went postal on the board because of an argument he was having with Greg, demanding to have his user named removed. Apparently he decided that Greg was using moderator powers to his own advantage. He then spammed the board with topic after topic, demanding that attention be given to his demand. It was either him or greg, one of them had to go.

Alternately, it is the Buddhist rapture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Sherab said:

So your rationalization does not work.

Malcolm wrote:

Just admit it, Sherab, you don't completely accept the Buddha's teaching "Where this exists, that exists". You don't completely accept "arising from conditions".

The Tantra that I mentioned, the sku gdung 'bar ba, explains very precisely all the causes and conditions for the arising of the various types of things we call "ring srel" aka śariraṃ, i.e. relics. There really isn't a detailed explanation for these phenomena outside of Dzogchen tantras.

Sakya Pandita says one must be cautious about relics: he doesn't rule out that they could be a result of realization, but he also observes that they could be mere formations of the four elements or even the artifices of demonic non-humans meant to deceive.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.

Content:

smcj said:

Well, thanks for the link anyway. It's over my head. I'm out of my league. It happens.

Thankfully I do not believe that my progress on the spiritual path is contingent on understanding this stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

Fundamentally speaking, the way Jayananda is understanding Chandrakirti is that the ālayavijñāna is the the consciousness that apprehends emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Chandrakirti accepts the ālayavijñāna. Tsongkhapa did not.

cloudburst said:

This is incorrect. Chandrakirti rejected the alayavijnana as it is being used in this discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

He rejected the yogacara interpretation, he did not however reject how it discussed in the Lanka, in fact he cites the Lanka in support of his interpretation...but didn't we already have this discussion?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

oushi said:

How come did your intentions dramatically change from pure to impure? Or, impure to pure...

Malcolm wrote:

It is very simple really — positive minds in samsara are still afflictive, apart from path dharma, and give forth afflicted results. Whatever is afflicted, even if it is positive, tends to produce suffering through its very impermanence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 9:52 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

dmr82 said:

It depends on what you're really after. But two still living masters displaying siddhis like the 84 mahasiddhas seems pretty relevant if one looks for confirmation of these abilities.

Malcolm wrote:

All of these things remain anecdotal, as I am sure you will admit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We can understand this because such stories are conspicuously absent from Chinese accounts of Indian Buddhism.

dmr82 said:

If you're interested in the Chinese versions of masters displaying such abilities you can find them in "Opening the Dragon Gate: The Making of a Modern Taoist Wizard" and "The Magus of Java". Both masters are still alive and can display everything Padmasambhava did. Over the years small groups from Europe have visited these masters in private and confirmed it's not mere fantasy or trickery but real abilities and manifestations of power.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not talking about tales of Taoist masters. Such stories, while interesting in their own right, are not relevant here.

I am talking about the reports of Chinese Buddhist pilgrims in India. They do not report the same kinds of tales that Tibetan pilgrims four centuries later report. In fact, Sino-Japanese Vajrayāna interestingly also lacks the emphasis on stories of siddhas, coming from an earlier epoch in the development of Vajrayāna. Of course there are the stock in trade mundane siddhis mentioned in early tantras like the Susiddhikara and so on that we find common to both Hindu and Buddhist sources, like the eye salve siddhi for finding buried treasures and so on, these things are mentioned in texts translated into Chinese, but there does not seem to be the same obsession with subduing Hindus we find, for example, in the life story of Virupa, or the treasure bios of Padmasambhava, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

dmr82 said:

Actually revealing terma is a siddhi.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN himself has said the klong gsal teachings are not, technically speaking "gter ma".

They are rmi chos, dream Dharmas, and as such, he has frequently admitted that he has a lot of capacity in this regard, which he has said manifested as a result of his contact with Rigzin Chanchub Dorje.

My other main Dzogchen master, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, revealed gter mas on my front porch (2005), teachings which I hold in the highest regard.

On the other hand, I have also found texts in famous terma cycles that are most definitely renovations of earlier texts (in one specific case I am thinking of, a text authored originally in the 12th century that also happens to be reported by Go Lotsawa by name] with "mis en scene" added for dramatic effect at the beginning. Robert Meyers and Cathy Cantwell's work on the treasures of Nyang ral Nyima Ozer are instructive in this regard as well.

In the case of the treasure tradition, perhaps it is wise to take Guru Chowang's dictum to heart, i.e., the entire universe is a gter ma. This perspective solves a lot of teleological problems.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Pero said:

Malcolm, if it's not too much of a personal question to answer so publicly, how much do you believe? ?

Malcolm wrote:

I try to believe as little as possible. I don't find beliefs to be very useful.

However, just because I don't believe some thing does not make that it false.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

dmr82 said:

This is one of the reasons siddhis are displayed by realized beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Historically speaking, tales of siddhas really only arise in India when Buddhism was in the process of being destroyed.

We can understand this because such stories are conspicuously absent from Chinese accounts of Indian Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, poverty and hunger are a result of stealing in past lives, etc. Being short lived is a result of killing, and so on.

oushi said:

Only if we assume that punishment requires a judge.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are adding the aspect of "judgement" and "punishment" and "reward" to it.

oushi said:

I personally think that karma spanning over many lifetimes is a sociological invention.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, so you don't believe in rebirth and karma. That's fine. The Buddha however taught it this way.

oushi said:

But even if we accept it, how is it, that we have people with fortunate birth (healthy, wealthy etc) who are, simply speaking, evil ? Since they have this fortunate life, they had to accumulate a lot of good karma before. How come, they have so much bad karma at the same time? It doesn't really calculate. Where do those drastic ups and downs come from?

Malcolm wrote:

If you would bother to study what the Buddha says about this, he explains this very clearly. Merely because you are favored in this life with wealth, beauty and so on is no guarantee that you are going to be a nice person. Being born poor, destitute, and without opportunity does not guarantee you will turn to a life of crime. Thus, a person who seems to have all advantages has accumulated a lot of positive action in the past, but by engaging in evil actions in this life they are exhausting their positive fortune in for future lives. A poor person who nevertheless is generous, kind and virtuous is creating positive actions that will ripen for them in terms of wealth, health and higher rebirth in the future.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

oushi said:

Mixing it with strict causality leads to such nonsense like hunger as a punishment for past life actions.

Malcolm wrote:

All pleasant, neutral and unpleasant sensations are a result of karma, i.e. karma vipaka.

These are not punishments, these are consequences of actions. For example, poverty and hunger are a result of stealing in past lives, etc. Being short lived is a result of killing, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Fair enough. I would still say, though, that (the Buddhist take would be that) all experience is due to karma. Even our experience of (apparently external) phenomena like the weather.

Malcolm wrote:

All pleasant, neutral and unpleasant sensations are results of karma.

But a thunderstorm is not the result of anything you did. It is not necessarily a karmavipaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

There is also the other Pali word for action (as becoming): bhava.

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't matter, karma/kamma as the Buddha defined them. That is the definition we ought to use.

Bhāva is not exactly karma, but some explanations assert that formations in the past life and becoming in this life mean "karma". But bhava is not really a word for action.

Likewise, some explanations consider ignorance in the past life and craving and addiction in this life to be affliction.

This the Sarvastivāda presentation, which is rejected by the Sautrantikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I am being a little more literal in my definition.

Malcolm wrote:

"Karma" aka "action", is not the same thing as activity, kṛt.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

cloudburst said:

This is interesting, could you explain further, please? Could you give an example of something that does not depend upon a karmic cause?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, we have to clarify which tenet system we are speaking from.

So, from the Sautrantika pov, the growth of inanimate things certainly depend on causes and conditions, but as they have no volition since they are living beings which possess only a material aggregate, their causes and conditions are not result of karma and they do not experience the ripening of karma because they are incapable of painful, pleasurable and indifferent feelings, which are necessarily the ripening of karma.

If it were the case that all causes were karma, there would be no purpose in first presenting the six causes and four conditions; then dependent origination and finally karma-vipaka.

The general Yogacara presentation will maintain that the container universe appears to us because of traces we share -- there are no external trees, planets, and so on on "out there", their appearances being a mere ripening of the traces of the ālayavijñāna.

Nāgārjuna too maintains that Karma is also volition and the results of those volitions. But he does not assert anywhere that I am aware of that all causes are karma.

Of course, how we sentient beings experience the container universe is precisely a ripening of our karma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Guty said:

"Once karmic winds get exhausted through completing the visions the body self-liberates into the basic space of phenomena. The self-aware enlightened mandala perfect from beginningless time becomes evident and one reaches perfect buddhahood. Your physical body is no more real than the thoughts that appear in your mind. Both are result of karmic winds/delusion and both self-liberate when abiding in rigpa. Rigpa is how karmic winds get exhausted. The visions arise as potentiality of rigpa. If the visions are completed before death the body self-liberates completely into the

great transfer without having to go through the bardo."

What is the source of this text? The Circle of the Sun from Tsele Natsok Rangdrol or some other?

Malcolm wrote:

His statement is more or less correct, if not very complete.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

PS Karma is just action, it is not necessarily intentional/volitional action (sankhara).

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha, Nagarjuna and Vasubandhu in one voice proclaim "Action [karma] is volition [cetana] and what proceeds from volition."

See the first two verses of chapter four of the Abhidharmakośa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 5th, 2014 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So you agree that experience is based on karma?

oushi said:

No, although it may be. If I suddenly feel pain in my hand, can I say it was intended? No, I experienced it without intending, without an action.

Malcolm wrote:

Not everything that happens, happens because of a karmic cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 4th, 2014 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Wouldn't you say they can be proven (and have been, and continue to be) but not empirically? Not within the narrow confines of the materialist paradigm? And they are

rather narrow, right?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I would not say that.

I would say that they remain unproven.

Materialists also have such beliefs, even if they are not aware of this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 4th, 2014 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Guty are you dmr82 on vajracakra?

dmr82 said:

He isn't. Dmr82 believes the physical body is merely a result of karma/delusion. Once karmic winds get exhausted through completing the visions the body self-liberates into the basic space of phenomena. The self-aware enlightened mandala perfect from beginningless time becomes evident and one reaches perfect buddhahood. Your physical body is no more real than the thoughts that appear in your mind. Both are result of karmic winds/delusion and both self-liberate when abiding in rigpa. Rigpa is how karmic winds get exhausted. The visions arise as potentiality of rigpa. If the visions are completed before death the body self-liberates completely into the great transfer without having to go through the bardo. People of such capacity can leave handprints in stone, dive into earth, penetrate mountain rock, sit in fire, walk on water, and fly in space.

Malcolm wrote:

That's what the texts say. Sounds easy, but it is not so easy. Even ChNN does not claim any of these abilities for himself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 4th, 2014 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Alaya consciousness - many questions.

Content:

Punya said:

If the storehouse consciousness is not accepted, presumably by the prasingikas, what is their explanation? I seem to remember something about consciousness carrying forward moment to moment but I've never understood it properly. Also, what are the manas? I've tried to research this without success.

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakirti accepts the ālayavijñāna. Tsongkhapa did not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 3rd, 2014 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Guty said:

Do I understand correctly, that what you mean is the phenomena is real from the inside from the perspective of the subject that realizes, but the allegations that physical bodies disappear are cultural myths?

Malcolm wrote:

Until I have proof of the contrary, this is my [admittedly unenlightened] perspective on the subject.

However, my teachers are adamant that such phenomena are real. So, I am very confident about the first part, since it corresponds with what is in the texts. I am less confident about the latter since I have not found textual support for it apart from legends, ancient and modern.

The tantra that deals with this subject most exhaustively is the sku gdung 'bar ba. But I have not read it yet in its entirety. It also has a 150 folio commentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 3rd, 2014 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

\ I believe that materialists just have to admit that not all phenomena are material and thus provable/observable/demonstratable via the empirical method.

Malcolm wrote:

They already have admitted this: hence the category of phenomena referred to as "non-falsifiable". They just tend to be sarcastic about it (and you are no stranger to sarcasm), considering such things as the flying spaghetti monster to be that kind of thing.

But in the end, Greg, we have beliefs we cannot prove. In that respect Buddhists are no better than Hindus, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 3rd, 2014 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Guty said:

I merely seek external confirmation, whether or not there is at all a possibility to meet the criteria of secular science when presenting this RB phenomenon as factual.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there isn't. Whoever imagined that there could be?

The theory of the body of light is predicted on the fundamental state of reality being something called wisdom, which has five lights, which are reified as physical matter. Upon completion of the path, one sees this matter in its real nature once again and the elements of the body "revert" to their original nature as wisdom (i.e. through the process of thogal on eradicates all the afflictive obscurations which prevent one from seeing things just as they are (yathabhutam))

Body of light is a realization. Rainbow body is cultural myth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 3rd, 2014 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Except that empirical verification is a just a tool in yet another conceptual system.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that "empirical" means can be demonstrated to someone who has no belief in a given phenomena, and can be repeated.

This weak, "one concept is no better than another concept" just makes Buddhists look like silly idiots when talking with materialists. It is much better to simply admit we have religious beliefs we cannot prove.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 3rd, 2014 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Karma and Reincarnation

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Except that karma and rebirth are not "beliefs".

Malcolm wrote:

Sure they are, karma and rebirth are completely non-falsifiable at present. Gravity, on the other hand, is falsifiable.

However, their absence of falsifiability does not mean the phenomena themselves are false, merely that they cannot be verified or disproven empirically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 3rd, 2014 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow bod

Content:

Guty said:

There is no need to stick with WHATSOEVER that is indemonstrable for the one who practices the path of dzogpachenpo.

Malcolm wrote:

You believe in a nonfalsifiable path, i.e. atiyoga, so you are already screwed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 3rd, 2014 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: Shamar on Monastic Buddhism in Tibet

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Is there something about the article that you find unclear?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 3rd, 2014 at 5:58 AM

Title: Shamar on Monastic Buddhism in Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<https://tinyurl.com/mlgeaxy>

Discuss...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 2nd, 2014 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

smcj said:

So are you sure about that "Dzogchen" association?

Malcolm wrote:

He wrote an article entitled "Dzogchen and Christianity" published in 1993.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 1st, 2014 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

brendan said:

Bringing out the "don't be sectarian line" is passive aggressive new ageism.

.

Malcolm wrote:

So I guess in your view, HHDL is a passive aggressive new ager?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 1st, 2014 at 6:36 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

tobes said:

I agree. Maybe I'm oversensitive, but it seems to me like some (most?) people like a good old fashioned sectarian dispute more than anything else.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, but when pushed to it...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 1st, 2014 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If they are discrete they form a series that leads to perception of time, that is the point.

Anders said:

They don't need to be any more discrete than apparently discrete objects in space like "table", "chair" or "atoms" for that to happen. That is, apparently discrete but not fundamentally so.

Malcolm wrote:

One thing that is escaping this discussion is that general buddhist concept of moments (relevant to Indian Buddhism in general from the Kosha) is actually based on the duration of a thought. That duration is something approximating 7 nanoseconds (it takes five nanoseconds for an impulse to travel across a neuron in the brain, longer for

neurons in the body). This aside, Sapan's argument is pretty tight:

Because the three times do not arise at once,
the present moment is partless.

This partless moment perishes as soon as it arises. It perishes immediately.

Partless moments are possible precisely because the three times are not substantially established.

Sapan maintains with respect to the question of whether such moments are ultimate or not, "...it is not the ultimate free from proliferation because of being perishable; the ultimate of efficient capability, because in the context of the investigating the empirical conventional authority all delusion and non-delusion depends upon moments."

In the case of the continuum of mind, for example, this is possible because the present moment of mind is neither the same nor different nor different than the previous moment of mind, indeed it is the same with all series [see MMK, chapter on Samskaras]. The series of partless moments will cease as soon as the conditions supporting it cease. Hence, the only way a continuum is actually possible requires partless moments. If moments have parts, there is no way to ensure the continuation of any series, because moments will have parts, and thus causes and their effects will be different, and thus one will have a large series of negative consequences stemming from this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 1st, 2014 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

ConradTree said:

Malcolm,

Would you agree that emptiness, in general, refers to nonarising / illusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness, in Mahāyāna, specifically refers to the absence of the four extremes in phenomena. This is the profound emptiness taught in Mahāyāna according to Gorampa and many other critics of Tsongkhapa, not the mere emptiness of inherent existence which is common which the śrāvaka systems.

Since phenomena cannot be found by any of the four extremes, they are illusory, and ultimately nonarisen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 6:47 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If they are discrete they form a series that leads to perception of time, that is the point.

Anders said:

Without duration there is no way for discrete objects to form a series.

Malcolm wrote:

A moment that has parts or duration leads to negative consequences as shown by Nagarjuna. In other words, moments will have arising, duration, and cessation. If moments have these three, these three parts must also have parts and so on. In this case then you are left with an infinite regress. Not only that, you are left with a definition of moments in which all three, past, present and future must exist simultaneously. Otherwise a moments arising does not exist now, its ceasing does not exist now, and its present duration can only exist with duration because the duration of the present moment is merely a conceptual designation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 6:35 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Anders said:

A series of durationless moments taking over from each other seamlessly doesn't make sense.

dharmagoat said:

An infinite number of durationless moments does.

Anders said:

Not if these moments are partless and therefore discrete.

Malcolm wrote:

If they are discrete they form a series that leads to perception of time, that is the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 6:34 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Anders said:

. A series of durationless moments taking over from each other seamlessly doesn't

make sense.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a mere assertion.

Anders said:

It is simple logic. If you assert a discrete object without duration then you have by definition asserted a non-temporal object.

What you propose is absurd.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I assert any discrete objects without duration? No.

You need to review Nagarjuna's refutation of time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 6:31 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsondru said:

Oh lord, TF ... Me and Malcolm have provided quotes contrary to things that you have said but you still keep on repeating your opinion without referencing anyone (re dzogchen). Though even a lineage masters of your was quoted .. you continue to go on with your prejudiced views.

Saying vajradhara/samantabhadra did not teach dzogchen, even attempting to make the dharmakaya into something sectarian!! Amazing!

Malcolm wrote:

It is useless to continue this line of discussion with TKf because his POV is clearly a minority view, even amongst Gelugpas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

conebeckham said:

It's all well and good, but ultimately I'm more interested in soteriological relevance than historical accuracy. And that's a good thing, I think.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh I agree, but TKf started in with all of this nonsense, making no effort to establish his view with recourse to reasoning, preferring instead to regale us with "Just so" stories. Well, I am pretty good at that too, maybe a little better, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Buddha Samantabhadra, the Dharmakāya aspect of Buddha Shakyamuni, taught Dzogchen

The Dharmakaya does not teach because it can only be perceived by other Buddhas.

The Dharmakaya manifests subtle and gross form bodies for the purpose of teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Master Sonam Tsemo contends:

If the teacher's sambhogakāya teaches Dharma to the retinue, if it is wondered how there can be teaching since the teacher's dharmakāya does not teach anything, since the mind of the teacher is the dharmakāya, it will also teach. Further, also the dharmakāya itself, demonstrates aspects of form. Its behavior as a Dharma teacher is called "Teacher Śrī Vajradhara". As the Tattvasamgraha says:

E ma ho, I am the stable being,
self-originated Samantabhadra.
Since he is stable, although without a body,
he transforms into the body of a being.

What do you imagine that name of the Buddha who teaches Dzogchen is? Why Samantabhadra, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

tobes said:

.....the science of Buddhism will never change. Doesn't it come down to a first principle?
I'll frame it thus:

" My school was founded by the second Buddha, whose word is equal to the first Buddha."

(Dzogchenpas vs Gelugpas...wow....fascinating, I've never seen that before....)

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it is more like, Dzogchen (according to its texts) was taught by the primordial ultimate Buddha [ye nas don dam pa'i sangs rgyas]. Everything else by the relative Buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

conebeckham said:

Wait, I thought Heruka Cakrasamvara appeared and taught tantra.....?!?!?

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakyapa position is that Cakrasamvara was not taught by Śākyamuni during this dispensation.

Loppon Sonam Tsemo states:

“Other than his general activities, he did not recite or teach later on. Having taught the Tattvasamgraha in the beginning, after completing that tantra he arrived in human lands....” and so on. Likewise, he performed the deeds of arriving in Jambudvīpa, etc., but he did not recite or teach the Śrī Cakrasamvara Tantra later on”

Not only did Śākyamuni not teach this during his eighty year sojourn in India, but also the root Yogatantra, Tattvasamgraha was not taught by Śākyamuni during this period either.

This is actually the position of the Indian master, Bhavyakīrti. He along with Bhavabhata maintain:

This teacher (i.e. Śākyamuni) having attained buddhahood in the beginningless past taught the Cakrasamvara tantras, but later, after becoming the son of Śuddodana, did not teach it. Their reasoning holds that since Cakrasamvara is continually practiced by the heros and yoginis of the twenty four countries, even when the eon forms and perished (the twenty four countries) do not form and perish so [the Cakrasamvara] does not disappear. Even though other dharmas may have also been taught in the beginning, since they are destroyed by the formation and perishing of the eon, since they disappear during the interval, they must be taught again by Śākyamuni.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Norwegian said:

What has gone astray, is your understanding Tsongkhapafan, which is sorely lacking. Not only that, but your reading comprehension is lacking as well:

" From the point of view of individually ascribed names, there are numerous traditions, such as those of the simultaneously arising as merged, the amulet box, possessing five, the six spheres of equal taste, the four syllables, the pacifier, the object to be cut off, dzogchen, the discursive madhyamaka view, and so on. Nevertheless, when scrutinized by a yogi, learned in scripture and logic and experienced (in meditation), their definitive meanings are all seen to come to the same intended point. "

From the page you yourself just linked.

Please rid yourself of your narrowmindedness and sectarianism, and be more open minded. Study more. You may learn something.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Thank you for pointing that out, I did make a mistake and didn't notice that reference, I scanned the document too hastily.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this means that for you, Dzogchen is valid because it is validated in a scripture you consider fundamental to your school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Buddha Vajradhara, the enjoyment body aspect of Buddha Shakyamuni, taught Tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha Samantabhadra, the Dharmakāya aspect of Buddha Shakyamuni, taught Dzogchen. So did Buddha Vajradhara on the Amolika rock of the Thirty Three Heavens.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

I don't really want to get into this as it is obviously pointless and divisive. Dzogchen is

not the entire basis of the Nyingma school, they follow Buddha's Sutra and Tantra teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is the pinnacle of the Nyingma schools teaching. They are the ultimate teaching of the Nyingma school. Dzogchen is Buddhahood as well as the basic reality out of which Buddhahood is realized.

Tsongkhapafan said:

There's no mention of Dzogchen at all in this.

Malcolm wrote:

You apparently do not read carefully. From the page you give:

From the point of view of individually ascribed names, there are numerous traditions, such as those of the simultaneously arising as merged, the amulet box, possessing five, the six spheres of equal taste, the four syllables, the pacifier, the object to be cut off, dzogchen, the discursive madhyamaka view, and so on.

Tsongkhapafan said:

when you start denigrating Nagarjuna...

Malcolm wrote:

No one denigrated Nāgārjuna.

Tsongkhapafan said:

...something that was not taught by Buddha at all...

Malcolm wrote:

There you go again with the sectarian, biased, rubbish-filled rhetoric that Dzogchen was not taught by a Buddha. I don't think you really want to go down the road of making accusations that some teachings were not taught by the Buddha such as certain practices which exist in certain quarters that come to mind...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

tobes said:

The very first post was about this - do the Gelugpas do philosophy or do they just learn old arguments and repeat them as truth?

Malcolm wrote:

Well that has been proven in the affirmative. TKfan merely trotted out a dogma without

bothering to defend it. According to him, the Buddha must have been a disciple of Candrakirti, otherwise, Buddha's enlightenment was impossible.

tobes said:

With all due respect to TKfan, I don't think we can take those statements as proof for what the Geshes are up to these days.....

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed. However, I am fairly certain that the way people are taught in India and Tibet has not really changed that much.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Buddha did not teach Dzogchen at all.

Malcolm wrote:

So you are maintaining the entire basis of the Nyingma school is not the Buddha's teaching?

You are maintaining that the first Panchen Lama was wrong to equate Great Madhyamaka, Mahamudra, Dzogchen, etc? He said in his Mahāmudra text:

Dzogchen, Mahamudra, Madhyamaka,
Lamdre, Chod, Zhiched, etc.,
Are various designations.
But if examined by an experienced yogi,
They lead to the same realization.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

tobes said:

The very first post was about this - do the Gelugpas do philosophy or do they just learn old arguments and repeat them as truth?

Malcolm wrote:

Well that has been proven in the affirmative. TKfan merely trotted out a dogma without

bothering to defend it. According to him, the Buddha must have been a disciple of Candrakirti, otherwise, Buddha's enlightenment was impossible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

daverupa said:

cromulent

Malcolm wrote:

not a word...especially since it was coined by the writer of the Simpsons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 31st, 2013 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

daverupa said:

How can it be amazing, when you also add the word 'supposedly'?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the people holding these kinds of views tend to have a very fundamentalist view of the history of Buddhist textual systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

If you want to dismiss Nagarjuna for something you regard as "higher" you will simply fall into asserting something that doesn't exist or negating something that does. Atisha said that there is Buddhahood in the Lineage of Nagarjuna and Chandrakirti and apart from this lineage, there is no Buddhahood, which is exactly what Chandrakirti is saying in the quote I gave above.

Malcolm wrote:

I always find it amazing when people prioritize the words of the treatises over the words that are supposedly the Buddha's; treating Tantras as somehow provisional, while treating Nāgārjuna's treatises as more definitive than the words attributed to the Buddha in the sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

tobes said:

No argument has been given which articulates why tantra is 'higher' than sutra.

There seems to be an unambiguous appeal to authority (text, tradition, master) to justify that claim.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the topic is off topic here. Second, the unambiguous appeal to authority runs for both the claim as well as the counterclaim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Atisha said that there is Buddhahood in the Lineage of Nagarjuna and Chandrakirti and apart from this lineage, there is no Buddhahood, which is exactly what Chandrakirti is saying in the quote I gave above.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so the Buddha was a disciple of Candrakirti?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 7:22 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I do however think that while Madhyamaka is the definitive sūtra view, the view of tantra in general goes beyond Madhyamaka.

.

Tsongkhapafan said:

You can't go beyond Madhyamaka as it is the definitive view, as Chandrakirti points out. As far as tantra goes, the only other refinement is to explain that phenomena are the nature of mind as well as the nature of emptiness. We might call this the Tantric Prasangika view and as such is not going beyond the Madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you can dogmatically assert this, but for example, if you wish to understand how the profound view of Vajrayāna is extraordinarily different from common Madhyamaka, then you must study the work of the Sakya master, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen, one of the

founder masters of Sakya, who wrote an extensive refutation of those who apprehend emptiness as the intrinsic nature of all phenomena in his presentation of the abhisamaya of the Hevajra Tantra called The Precious Wish Fulfilling Tree, which also treats Prasanga Madhyamaka in its section on the four tenets.

Of course it is rather pointless to tell you this, because even if you could read Tibetan you would not read this text with anything but a jaundiced eye.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

ཚུལ་མེད་

Malcolm wrote:

Is that basically emptiness?[/quote]

More or less.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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".

dzogchungpa said:

What is 'nonphenomena' in the Tibetan?

Malcolm wrote:

ཚུལ་མེད་

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

I didn't realise that Nagarjuna is nonsense. No one who follows the genuine teachings of Buddha seems to think so since they all followed the essential meaning of the Prajnaparamita Sutras which is summarised in Nagarjuna's view and attained liberation

and enlightenment as a result.

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna is not nonsense, at least I do not think so.

I do however think that while Madhyamaka is the definitive sūtra view, the view of tantra in general goes beyond Madhyamaka.

However, that being said, there is in the end no difference in meaning between the great perfection, prajñāpāramita and mahāmudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

If you reject the two truths, there is no spiritual path.

Malcolm wrote:

Not for you, perhaps. For others, on the other hand, there seems to be a very vital and important path, even though it transcends the Madhyamaka notion of the two truths. In order to familiarize you a little more with the Dzogchen point of view, a very early commentary presents the Dzogchen approach to the two truths:

Here, since the two truths have been inseparable from the beginning, the two truths are not presented individually even conventionally. The madhyamaka deviation is dividing up dharmatā and dharmin into ultimate and relative and then training in the ultimate as supreme. 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".

However, we are not talking about Dzogchen here, we are talking about Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

ConradTree said:

But Rongzom says Dzogchen rejects any relative truth.

Dzogchen only subscribes to 1 truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we were talking about sutra.

Further, Dzogchen rejects the two truths, because relative "truth" is not true, being a deluded cognition. But Dzogchen does not reject appearances which appear to ignorance (ma rig pa).

Dzogchen substitutes vidyā and āvidyā (rig pa and ma rig pa) for the term "pāramārtha satya" and "samvṛitti satya".

Also one will discover that Dzogchen, in rejecting the two truths, also rejects ultimate truth, as it states in The Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra:

Since there is no ultimate, also the name "relative" does not exist.

And as it says in Soaring Great Garuda:

Since phenomena and nonphenomena have always been merged and are inseparable, there is no further need to explain an "ultimate phenomenon".

So not only is the relative negated in Dzogchen, so is any concept of ultimate.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

This definition of hidden explains nothing as it would simply mean that all phenomena will be hidden from normal cognition and therefore cannot explain why you used the term "hidden phenomena" in your reply to my earlier question.

Malcolm wrote:

Hidden simply means "Not accessible" to ordinary cognition. For example, the ability of a yogi to levitate is "hidden", you can't tell by looking at someone whether they have this capacity or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

If the yogi through samadhi has power over the elements, would he not be able to produce milk from a picture of a cow?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Pictures of cows do not produce milk ever.

Of course, in didactic stories meant to impress children, on the other hand, all kinds of miracles are possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 30th, 2013 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

cloudburst said:

you apparently fail to see that it is the negating of essence or self that in one stroke negates all four extremes, since the characteristic of being an extreme depends entirely upon essential existence.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not fail to see that; however, it is necessary for we commoners to run through the four-fold negation with regard to the four extremes. It is not necessary for āryas.

For example, there are some, for example, Jains, who maintain that things in a state of arising both exist and not exist at the same time. Therefore, in addition to refuting existence and non-existence, it is necessary to refute both [existent and non-existent] as well as neither.

For this reason, solely negating inherent existence is fine as a short cut for an experienced Mādhyamika; but maintaining the refutation of inherent existence alone will lead to the realization of freedom from extremes is doubtful except in the case of someone who is extremely bright.

By asserting that emptiness is the mere non-existence of true existence, the emptiness which is the absence of inherent existence, one runs a real risk of leading people to two conclusions: the intellectual approximation of emptiness as a non-existence is appropriate; the ultimate is a form of non-existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

[I think arguments based off the conventional can only be use to point to the possibility of an ultimate but cannot come to a conclusion on the ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

The ultimate, from the Madhyamaka POV, is simply the absence of the four extremes in

the relative. Also the ultimate does not exist according to any of the four extremes. The best you can say about the ultimate is that it is inexpressible.

Sherab said:

My understanding of what is taught in the suttas and sutras is that the ultimate IS inexpressible. There is no two ways about it.

Malcolm wrote:

There is inexpressible and then there is inexpressible; how one arrives at inexpressibility is critical.

Hindus also claim that their ultimate is beyond predicates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

Why is the above different from production/arising from dissimilar causes/conditions?

Malcolm wrote:

"Hidden" means what is not accessible to normal cognition, for example, atoms. In the case of supernormal phenomena, like power over the elements this is based on the cause of samadhi, and so on. In other words, without the realization of certain yogic skills, certain powers are not attainable. If these skills are attained, even though it may seem "miraculous" to the average person, nevertheless there is proper cause and condition governing the production of such phenomena on the relative level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

For the same reason that you have not told me my why you disagree with my argument, I am unable to understand your claim that my argument above would imply that "we would have no basis for rejecting creation by a supreme creator deity"

Malcolm wrote:

If you suggest that there can be production from dissimilar causes, a claim explicitly rejected in all Madhyamaka texts, you are allowing, for example, that unconditioned phenomena, for example God, can produce conditioned phenomena, for example, the world.

I also gave you the example of the production of maize from wheat seeds, chickens from cows and so on.

Since I have in fact answered all of your qualms in detail already, and am merely repeating answers I have already given, I can only conclude from this that you are incapable of actually reading my posts and will not longer respond to your questions about this. You clearly have some need to believe in things which are not reasonable from a Buddhist point of view.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

[I think arguments based off the conventional can only be use to point to the possibility of an ultimate but cannot come to a conclusion on the ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

The ultimate, from the Madhyamaka POV, is simply the absence of the four extremes in the relative. Also the ultimate does not exist according to any of the four extremes. The best you can say about the ultimate is that it is inexpressible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

I was arguing that accepting the phenomena of miracles would entail production/arising from dissimilar causes/conditions and that would throw off kilter the generally accepted notion of production/arising from similar causes/conditions.

Malcolm wrote:

We really don't have the loaves and fishes thing in Buddhadharma. All so called "miraculous" events in Buddhadharma are products of samadhi, so they have a cause and condition that does not circumvent our standard and conventional notions of causality. Otherwise, as I said, we would have no basis for rejecting creation by a supreme creator deity.

Sherab said:

There is also another issue that I have not raised as yet, that is whether the ability of siddhas to control the elements entails an ability to break the the conventional relationship between cause and effect.

Malcolm wrote:
No, it does not.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 8:32 PM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

Anders said:
. A series of durationless moments taking over from each other seamlessly doesn't make sense.

Malcolm wrote:
This is a mere assertion.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 6:49 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

Anders said:
How can a moment have no duration? This seems an absurd position. If something lacks duration, how can it even be temporal (and therefore impermanent)?

Malcolm wrote:
If a moment has duration, it will have a past, a present and future. Since the past no longer exists, since the future is yet to be, the present cannot have parts at all, and thus moments by definition cannot possess duration.

When you stop to think about it, partless moments are the only thing that make sense.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 4:34 AM
Title: Re: Eckart Tolle - master of the park bench
Content:

tatpurlusa said:
Well This was in a personal interview anyway. And I don't doubt it, because I know that person really well.

mutsuk said:
I personally discussed issues such as westerners wasting their time in other tradition than buddhism/bon, etc. He was adamant. He said "If you want to progress, you'd better

put all your eggs in the same basket. Progress takes time, nobody has enough time to waste in "mu-stegs-pa business"." ("mu-stegs-pa business" was in anglo-tibetan).

Malcolm wrote:

One positive aspect of studying tīrthika doctrines with Tīrthika masters is that it will make one realize with surety that tīrthika view and practice is not really compatible with Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Otherwise, if we allow production from dissimilar causes we will have NO BASIS FOR REFUTING CREATION BY GOD. In that case, one will undermine the entire basis of Buddhadharma.

dzogchungpa said:

Is a definition of 'similar/dissimilar' in this context available? It seems like this would be an important point to clarify.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for example, wheat growing from maize. Cows giving birth to chickens, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

oushi said:

I watched this lecture today, and I was like... WOW! It's about the nature, power and potential of mushrooms.

```
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]
```

There is also something about neuron-like behavior of mycelium.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Staments work is interesting, especially in using fungi for decontamination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

I prefer the argument of Sakya Pandita actually, who argues that partless moments cannot be refuted even by Madyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

Partless moments are figments of imagination. Therefore Sakya Pandita was saying that figments of imagination cannot be refuted by Madyamaka. Since inherent existence is also a figment of imagination, therefore, inherent existence cannot be refuted by Madyamaka.

[/quote]

No, Sakya Pandita was saying that partless moments were conventionally ultimate (as opposed to being the ultimate of the freedom from proliferation) because they have no duration and therefore they cannot be refuted by Madhyamaka reasonings (which only aims at particles that are conceived of as having duration). He is distinctly not saying these are figments of imagination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 29th, 2013 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

You must then allow for production from conventional conditions and production from non-conventional conditions. In other words, you must allow for the possibility of production from dissimilar conditions, which was my earlier point.

Malcolm wrote:

No. But one can imagine conditions which while being conventional, are not immediately accessible to ordinary cognitions.

To allow for the possibility of production from dissimilar causes is to allow for creation by God, for example.

Sherab said:

Are you saying that conditions not accessible by ordinary cognitions allowed, say, Chandrakirti to get milk from a picture of a cow while ordinary beings can only get milk from a conventional cow? If yes, then that is exactly what I meant when I said that you have to allow for dissimilar conditions that can produce the same thing. But that would ruin the idea of conventional cause and effect wouldn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

You are really not paying attention. I said:

For example, Candra's milking a cow might have been an illusion generated by his capacity in *rdḍhipati*.

I never admitted that Candra could produce valid, functional milk from the picture of a cow.

Sherab said:

"Are you saying that conditions not accessible by ordinary cognitions allowed"

Malcolm wrote:

I am speaking of "hidden phenomena". But even hidden phenomena must obey the laws of conventionality. Otherwise, if we allow production from dissimilar causes we will have NO BASIS FOR REFUTING CREATION BY GOD. In that case, one will undermine the entire basis of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 10:24 AM

Title: Re: Musings on Kali Yuga

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you accept the Kalacakra dates for the parinirvana of the Buddha (927 BCE), Rudra Cakravartin is supposed to defeat the Muslims in 2430 (1800 years after the conquest of Mecca),.

theanarchist said:

The muslims ???

There is something in the Kalachakra texts about Muslims?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Anders said:

And irreducible phenomena is necessarily uncaused.

Malcolm wrote:

The please explain the parts of the vedana and samjñā skandhas. For that matter, what are the "parts" of sraddha? Krodha? etc.? What are the parts of the vijñāna skandha?

I will tell you, they are momentary and exist in a causal series. But in themselves they are irreducible while being at the same time impermanent and therefore, conditioned.

Sherab said:

The argument of momentariness raise the issue of whether you take time as discrete or continuous. If you take time as discrete, then there is always a discrete moment in which a thing does not change. But this will contradict the idea of things always changing. If you take time as continuous, then there is no time between one moment and another, so no change is possible from one moment to another. (I am using an argument of Ven Nanavira here.)

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer the argument of Sakya Pandita actually, who argues that partless moments cannot be refuted even by Madyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

You must then allow for production from conventional conditions and production from non-conventional conditions. In other words, you must allow for the possibility of production from dissimilar conditions, which was my earlier point.

Malcolm wrote:

No. But one can imagine conditions which while being conventional, are not immediately accessible to ordinary cognitions.

To allow for the possibility of production from dissimilar causes is to allow for creation by God, for example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That special connection is nothing more than the dependent origination you create with that teacher. You cannot take those promises outside of empowerment at all.

dzogchungpa said:

I've often wondered what exactly is going on during an empowerment. I don't see how saying this special connection is the dependent origination created with that teacher really explains anything. Could you elaborate?

Malcolm wrote:

You have five aggregates; these are the cause. The teacher arranges their connection to the five buddhas, the result, through the empowerment. If you don't attain buddhahood during the empowerment, then you have a path to follow.

Most people do not understand that abhisheka is primarily a method of attaining buddhahood, and only secondarily, an introduction to a path.

When we talk about dependent origination, there are five: outer, inner, secret, ultimate and sucheness. If you really want to understand this, then you should go and study Lamdre with the Sakyapas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That special connection is nothing more than the dependent origination you create with that teacher. You cannot take those promises outside of empowerment at all.

dzogchungpa said:

I've often wondered what exactly is going on during an empowerment. I don't see how saying this special connection is the dependent origination created with that teacher really explains anything. Could you elaborate?

Malcolm wrote:

You have five aggregates; these are the cause. The teacher arranges their connection to the five buddhas, the result, through the empowerment. If you don't attain buddhahood during the empowerment, then you have a path to follow.

Most people do not understand that abhisheka is primarily a method of attaining buddhahood, and only secondarily, an introduction to a path.

When we talk about dependent origination, there are five: outer, inner, secret, ultimate and sucheness. If you really want to understand this, then you should go and study Lamdre with the Sakyapas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Kalachakra in Dzogchen Community

Content:

heart said:

Interesting that Rinpoche is calling the Longsal Kalachakra Ati and Changchub Dorje's

Kalachakra Anu. Or did I misunderstand?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, you did not misunderstand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

theanarchist said:

It's harmful because you have made a promise, and that is the connection; this is why "dam tshig", "solemn word" is how Tibetans translate the term samaya. There is no mystical basis for samaya. It is premised strictly on accepting a set of promises.

No, it's not harmful because you have made a promise. It is harmful because in the initiation you made that special connection.

Malcolm wrote:

That special connection is nothing more than the dependent origination you create with that teacher. You cannot take those promises outside of empowerment at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

theanarchist said:

It's harmful because you have made a promise, and that is the connection; this is why "dam tshig", "solemn word" is how Tibetans translate the term samaya. There is no mystical basis for samaya. It is premised strictly on accepting a set of promises.

No, it's not harmful because you have made a promise. It is harmful because in the initiation you made that special connection.

Malcolm wrote:

That special connection is nothing more than the dependent origination you create with that teacher. You cannot take those promises outside of empowerment at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Musings on Kali Yuga

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The duration and chronological starting point in human history of Kali Yuga has given rise to different evaluations and interpretations. According to the Surya Siddhanta, Kali Yuga began at midnight (00:00) on 18 February 3102 BCE in the proleptic Julian calendar, or 14 January 3102 BC in the proleptic Gregorian calendar. This date is also considered by many Hindus to be the day that Krishna left Earth to return to his abode.

From the book The Indus Script and the Rg-Veda

So that places "2000 years ago" about 1000 years into the Kali Yuga. The Kali Yuga is supposed to last 432,000 years, (and there is a 10,000 year Golden Age tucked away in there somewhere).

Malcolm wrote:

While Buddhist notion of the four ages based on Kalacakra are a little different, this is the Buddhist Kali Yuga. This is based on concept that the Buddha's teaching will endure for 5000 years. Check the Ornament of Stainless Light by the 15th century Gelug master Khedrup Norzang Gyatso.

If you accept the Kalacakra dates for the parinirvana of the Buddha (927 BCE), Rudra Cakravartin is supposed to defeat the Muslims in 2430 (1800 years after the conquest of Mecca), at the end of the Buddhist Kali Yuga. This will issue in another four Buddhist ages and all told, Buddhadharma is supposed to last in this world roughly 5000 years altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Musings on Kali Yuga

Content:

smcj said:

This is not like the "where's Mt. Meru" thread to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is -- in Buddhist mythological texts there is clearly described a progressive degeneration to the present day. In the treta yuga for example, humans are supposed to have had limitless lifespans. Then in the second age, lifespans of 80,000 years and so on, down to the pathetic one hundred years (if you're lucky) lifespan of the present day.

The best explanation I have seen is that a "golden" age depends on the virtue of the rulers. Hence, the longing we often see expressed on this board to return to some form of "Dharma monarchy".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Anders said:

And irreducible phenomena is necessarily uncaused.

Malcolm wrote:

The please explain the parts of the vedana and samjñā skandhas.

PadmaVonSamba said:

perception = means of perception (eyes, brain) + object of perception (picture of cow)

feeling = means of feeling (fingers, brain)+ object of feeling (fuzzy sweater)

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but what are the parts of the mental factor of feeling, the third thing that is produced? You have described how it is generated, not what it is. When you have a pleasant feeling or a painful feeling, what are the parts of that feeling itself?

You have described how a percept is caused, but not what it is. When you have discerned a blue pot, what are the parts of that percept itself?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 28th, 2013 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: Kalachakra in Dzogchen Community

Content:

Virgo said:

How much is my limitation? If I missed the first day and listened to it on replay I did not receive the lung for the ganapuja to be done after donwong, do then I have missed my opportunity for this?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

He gave it again today.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

If Chandrakirti's cow milking story is to be disbelieved, we must similarly disbelieve any miracle stories. So if Nagarjuna's intent is to say that production from dissimilar causes are disallowed, then miracles are impossibilities.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily. For example, Candra's milking a vow might have been an illusion generated by his capacity in *ṛddhipati*. Buddha's ability to levitate to the height of fourteen palms trees is clearly based on his command over the four elements.

All of these things have causes that seem miraculous to others since they do not see the inner workings of cause and condition. But I am quite certain Candra never obtained real milk from a picture of a cow. I am equally certain, since we know almost nothing of Candra from sources other than Tibetan (which conflate two Candrakirtis anyway), that this is little more than a pedagogical legend, like most of these stories, which also generally have outer, inner and secret interpretations and generally cannot be taken at face value.

My preferred Candra story is the one where after accidentally running into a pillar at Nalanda because he was looking at a book while walking, a student said "Ha, so that pillar is really "empty", isn't it?"

To which Candra replied by passing his hand through the pillar.

All conditioned phenomena arise from conditions. When we do not understand those conditions, we call those events "miracles".

If this is not the case, then we must consider Nagārjuna, and even the Buddha, liars for presenting miracles that violate the very principle of production from conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Anders said:

And irreducible phenomena is necessarily uncaused.

Malcolm wrote:

The please explain the parts of the vedana and samjñā skandhas. For that matter, what are the "parts" of sraddha? Krodha? etc.? What are the parts of the vijñāna skandha?

I will tell you, they are momentary and exist in a causal series. But in themselves they are irreducible while being at the same time impermanent and therefore, conditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

theanarchist said:

Then of course there is the four Dzogchen "samayas", which are unbreakable since they are not conditioned.

Other vajrayana samaya connections are just as unbreakable.

Malcolm wrote:

Not what I meant. What I meant was that Dzogchen samayas are connected with reality. The 22 Vajrayāna samayas of the new tantra schools or the 29 samayas of the old tantra tradition are connected with view and conduct.

theanarchist said:

Because even if it's nowhere as explicit as in dzogchen, in a highest yogatantra initiation what makes the initiation valid is the conference of a spark of the absolute nature of the deity.

Malcolm wrote:

No divine spark is implanted, Gurus are not creator gods.

What happens during an anuttarayoga initiation is an arrangement of dependent origination. Each initiation has its own samayas connected with the practices which it permits one to do. Please Kongtrul's Buddhist Ethics for a full account.

theanarchist said:

The vows you take during an initiation are vows, they are not the actual samaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they are.

theanarchist said:

The actual samaya is the connection you make with the teacher by receiving initiation, the vows are a tool that enables the disciple to progress on that path in a meaningful way.

Malcolm wrote:

The vows are what maintain that connection. When you break those, you break the connection.

theanarchist said:

It is not harmful because you made some promise, it's harmful because it not following those rules is in itself harmful once you have made this type of connection.

Malcolm wrote:

It's harmful because you have made a promise, and that is the connection; this is why

"dam tshig", "solemn word" is how Tibetans translate the term samaya. There is no mystical basis for samaya. It is premised strictly on accepting a set of promises.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

theanarchist said:

Then of course there is the four Dzogchen "samayas", which are unbreakable since they are not conditioned.

Other vajrayana samaya connections are just as unbreakable.

Malcolm wrote:

Not what I meant. What I meant was that Dzogchen samayas are connected with reality. The 22 Vajrayāna samayas of the new tantra schools or the 29 samayas of the old tantra tradition are connected with view and conduct.

theanarchist said:

Because even if it's nowhere as explicit as in dzogchen, in a highest yogatantra initiation what makes the initiation valid is the conference of a spark of the absolute nature of the deity.

Malcolm wrote:

No divine spark is implanted, Gurus are not creator gods.

What happens during an anuttarayoga initiation is an arrangement of dependent origination. Each initiation has its own samayas connected with the practices which it permits one to do. Please Kongtrul's Buddhist Ethics for a full account.

theanarchist said:

The vows you take during an initiation are vows, they are not the actual samaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they are.

theanarchist said:

The actual samaya is the connection you make with the teacher by receiving initiation, the vows are a tool that enables the disciple to progress on that path in a meaningful way.

Malcolm wrote:

The vows are what maintain that connection. When you break those, you break the connection.

theanarchist said:

It is not harmful because you made some promise, it's harmful because it not following

those rules is in itself harmful once you have made this type of connection.

Malcolm wrote:

It's harmful because you have made a promise, and that is the connection; this is why "dam tshig", "solemn word" is how Tibetans translate the term samaya. There is no mystical basis for samaya. It is premised strictly on accepting a set of promises.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Musings on Kali Yuga

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

And I started to think about all the whinging and whining in regards to Kali Yuga and the destruction of the Dharma teachings. It occurred to me that we are here now in Kali Yuga as a consequence of our karma (actions) in the past. We all lived during the Satya Yuga (the Golden Age) and yet obviously we "pissed" away our opportunity to achieve enlightenment under those incredibly fortunate conditions.

Malcolm wrote:

The four ages is a nearly universal theme worldwide.

Interestingly, some Native American schemes presents each age [parsed as Suns] as an improvement over the last.

Though not an easy read, Witzel's The Origins of the World's Mythologies provides much interesting context for all the world's mythologies such as the four ages and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Kalachakra in Dzogchen Community

Content:

Tenpa said:

What is the specific use/function of this Kalachakra Atiyoga practice?
tks.

Malcolm wrote:

Total realization. Might improve your astrological skills too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

But it would seem that the convention of how things exist relatively can be violated as well. The getting of milk from a conventional cow and from a pictorial cow comes to mind. So are conventional beings supposed to accept that radically different conditions can produce the same conventional thing?

Malcolm wrote:

I have never heard of anyone successfully milking a picture of a cow.

Sherab said:

If I remembered correctly, there was story about Chandrakirti getting milk from a picture of a cow. Anyway, Nagarjuna said that with emptiness everything is possible.

Malcolm wrote:

Including production from a dissimilar cause? i think you have not understood Nagarjuna's intent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 9:52 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They are simples.

PadmaVonSamba said:

can you explain a little more?

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

They are irreducible, however they are also momentary, and hence conditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Am I missing something?

How can these skandhas be said to happen
in a way that can be called irreducible?

- .
- .
- .

Malcolm wrote:

Irreducible does not mean unconditioned.

PadmaVonSamba said:

It means it can't be reduced to anything beyond than what it is.

I don't see how if something isn't the result of causes, it is Irreducible.

If perception and feeling can be divided into subject and object,
how are they Irreducible?

are perception and feeling established as pre-existing qualities

that occur even with or without the objects of perception and feeling?

- .
- .
- .

Malcolm wrote:

They are simples.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Am I missing something?

How can these skandhas be said to happen
in a way that can be called irreducible?

- .
- .
- .

Malcolm wrote:

Irreducible does not mean unconditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

theanarchist said:

No, personal experience with empowerment, the way vajrayana practice works in general, logical conclusion taking into account the mechanics of vows and karma. And i have heard teachings on the subject.

Although I am sure I can dig up something on samaya in some scriptures, I haven't studied scriptures in a while.

Malcolm wrote:

All vows, including samaya, are nothing more than a series of intent, which are disrupted due to engaging in acts contrary to that initial intent. There is nothing mystical or psychic about receiving samaya vows. They are received when one recites the commitments after the master during the empowerment. The receipt of samaya is something very precise.

Then of course there is the four Dzogchen "samayas", which are unbreakable since they are not conditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

theanarchist said:

No, personal experience with empowerment, the way vajrayana practice works in general, logical conclusion taking into account the mechanics of vows and karma. And i have heard teachings on the subject.

Although I am sure I can dig up something on samaya in some scriptures, I haven't studied scriptures in a while.

Malcolm wrote:

All vows, including samaya, are nothing more than a series of intent, which are disrupted due to engaging in acts contrary to that initial intent. There is nothing mystical or psychic about receiving samaya vows. They are received when one recites the commitments after the master during the empowerment. The receipt of samaya is something very precise.

Then of course there is the four Dzogchen "samayas", which are unbreakable since they are not conditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

theanarchist said:

Nope. Samaya is not a promise but a psychic connection with the teacher that you get when the teacher confers initiation and you receive it.

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting opinion. No textual support, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

theanarchist said:

Nope. Samaya is not a promise but a psychic connection with the teacher that you get when the teacher confers initiation and you receive it.

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting opinion. No textual support, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The vedana skandha and the saṃjñā skandha are irreducible.

PadmaVonSamba said:

That may be what is traditionally taught,
but it isn't how it looks to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have to specify what the parts of these things are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 8:00 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab said:

But it would seem that the convention of how things exist relatively can be violated as well. The getting of milk from a conventional cow and from a pictorial cow comes to mind. So are conventional beings supposed to accept that radically different conditions can produce the same conventional thing?

Malcolm wrote:

I have never heard of anyone successfully milking a picture of a cow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 7:02 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

tobes said:

Everyone is always sure that the opponent has been nailed.

Few ever make the effort to actually understand the opponent.

Can you nail something you don't actually understand??

Malcolm wrote:

Having studied Saṃkhya at the feet of someone quite expert in it, I can say that I understand Saṃkhya well enough to endorse Buddhapalita's refutation of it.

Being the son of a western philosophy professor, however, I am also sure that the same arguments and examples get used in all kinds of traditions.

Huifeng is correct, however, Saṃghabhadra's (pissed off) commentary on the Kośa is a good presentation which goes to some length to preserve Sarvastivāda epistemology.

On the other hand, most tenet system literature presents a mockery of the opponents position.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because he is laying the intellectual basis for the later application of his ideas in Mahamudra practice, etc. There is no such thing as an actual application of western philosophy.

Ummmm, Nāgārjuna who wrote the MMK is demonstrably earlier (later [sic]) than the siddha Nāgārjuna, disciple of Saraha, who write the Bodhicittavivarana, the Pañcakrama and so on.

smcj said:

So you are saying that there is no relevance to meditation of soteriological value to the MMK?

Malcolm wrote:

MMK is pretty much strictly an analytical text. However, Rongton Sheja Kunrig explained an "intimate instruction" madhyamaka which involves contemplating the examples of illusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are three skandhas which are caittas, mental factors, which always accompany citta i.e. the vijñāna skandha.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Yes, I understand that. but when you break those down...

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

The vedana skandha and the saṃjñā skandha are irreducible. The formation skandha on the other hand contains 51 to 100 hundred factors depending on whose scheme you are following. These factors are also irreducible. In other words, apart from their momentariness, they have no further parts into which they can be divided.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I have no "outcome". I haven't yet decided if Nagarjuna is a genius, full of shit, or a bit of both. (probably a bit of both: why should he differ from any other philosopher?)

smcj said:

Because he is laying the intellectual basis for the later application of his ideas in Mahamudra practice, etc. There is no such thing as an actual application of western philosophy.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm, Nāgārjuna who wrote the MMK is demonstrably earlier than the siddha Nāgārjuna, disciple of Saraha, who wrote the Bodhicittavivarana, the Pañcakrama and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, like I said, what you are terming "awareness" is actually the samjñā-skandha, which is in turn actually a mental factor.

PadmaVonSamba said:

But the skandhas are also components factors, are they not? They have to occur as a result of causes.

So, I think there is a better term than my using the word 'awareness'.

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

There are three skandhas which are caittas, mental factors, which always accompany citta i.e. the vijñāna skandha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 27th, 2013 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

People can detect consciousness.

Consciousness can be an object of awareness.

what I mean by that is

you are cognitive of the fact that you yourself are thinking these words.

and you can infer that someone else wrote them.

When we meditate, we are aware of thoughts arising.

We can detect consciousness (the arising of awareness with objects of awareness) in others

even though we do not directly experience their exact experience.

We can ask, "what do you hear?" and observe that other beings experience cognitive function.

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, like I said, what you are terming "awareness" is actually the samjñā-skandha, which is in turn actually a mental factor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

People can detect consciousness.

Consciousness can be an object of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

An unsupported consciousness cannot be an object of another's consciousness since there is nothing by which it can be perceived. A supported consciousness can be an object of another's consciousness.

However, in the view of Candrakīrti, one's own consciousness cannot take itself as an object.

I don't really know what you mean by awareness. Awareness is generally held to be a property of consciousness. It is, in my opinion, a mental factor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: In the KUNJED GYALPO says it is of no use to do rituals

Content:

Ivo said:

Yes, definitely. Can we apply it as beginners? No. If we try, we will fail. We have not accumulated the causes in our midstream. We still don't have the merit.

Malcolm wrote:

This is definitely not the view of Dzogchen. Dzogchen realization does not depend on accumulating causes of any kind.

On the other hand, there is no reason to stop doing practices related to the cause and result vehicles either.

It's all good.

Since nirvana is also not perceived, there is also freedom from the convention "buddha", i.e. the great meaning, the inherently pure efforts of lower yānas are not abandoned. Since the identity of the result is naturally perfected, all effort of qualities self-arose without effort. Freedom from gradual progress in this is the naturally perfected result itself.

-- The Sun that Illuminates the Meaning (A commentary on the Cuckoo of Vidyā, which is also chapter 31 of the Kun byed rGyal po.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

not so fast kimosabe. Conventional production=dependent origination=hallucination of illusory production by deluded beings. yes, no, or maybe?

Malcolm wrote:

It's pretty clear from Candra's language that there should be an object to be seen correctly or falsely. This means there must be an appearance about which one is either mistaken or unmistaken. When one unmistakenly sees the apparent objects which serves as the basis for imputation (hearkening back to your original qualm), depending on which strand of Tibetan Madhyamaka one is following:

- a) the objects themselves do not actually arise in truth and are considered to be no more than illusions, and so on
- b) the objects themselves arise from causes and conditions conventionally (i.e. not causelessly, from single causes, from self, other, or dissimilar causes). What objects do not do is arise inherently.

Candra presupposes a Sautrantika epistemology where sense consciousnesses only arise when sense objects are encountered by contact with sense organs. For Candra, a sense consciousness will never arise in absence of a sense object or a sense organ, and this is clearly stated in the Madhyamakāvatara. Thus, the question of what the delusion actually is remains a matter of debate amongst Mādhyamika proponents.

What we can see from all of this is that since "Mādhyamikas" cannot agree amongst themselves, not to mention the other three tenets, indeed the "science" of Buddhism has undergone much change and transformation, like any body of human knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Khenpo Tsultrim said:

Chandrakrti was the great proponent of the Prasangika system, and he relied a lot on arguments that show that dharmas did not arise.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, or in other words, in reality, arising cannot be established for phenomena. Conventionally or relatively speaking, Candrakīrti eliminates arising without a cause, from single causes, dissimilar causes or from self or other, leaving only arising from conditions as the only valid option.

Those who do not see this point do not understand either Nāgārjuna or Candrakīrti.

smcj said:

I have no intention of investing myself in the details of this discussion, but I do have confidence enough in Khenpo Tsultrim's credentials to believe his characterization of Chandrakīrti has some credibility. YMMV.

Malcolm wrote:

It is worthwhile here to repost the master's own words from his own magnum opus, Prasannapāda:

Therefore, that being the case, here when the Bhagavan clarified the production of things depending on cause and condition, he refuted the production of things causelessly, from a single cause, a dissimilar cause, or generated by self and other. Since those were refuted, the intrinsic nature of relative things was taught according to how they exist relatively.

Please compare this with what I stated above:

Conventionally or relatively speaking, Candrakīrti eliminates arising without a cause, from single causes, dissimilar causes or from self or other, leaving only arising from conditions as the only valid option.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Toes and digital pads (of a paw) are both digits, but I imagine you would not use the terms interchangeably, so... stop being unjustifiably defensive.

Malcolm wrote:

In some languages there is no separate word for toes, for example, Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 10:04 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Thus, your thesis that Nāgārjuna rejects arising conventionally is not to be found in the thought of Candrakīrti, etc.

gad rgyangs said:

There is conventional production.

Malcolm wrote:

Case closed. We agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

smcj said:

Chandrakīrti was the great proponent of the Prasāṅgika system, and he relied a lot on arguments that show that dharmas did not arise.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, or in other words, in reality, arising cannot be established for phenomena. Conventionally or relatively speaking, Candrakīrti eliminates arising without a cause, from single causes, dissimilar causes or from self or other, leaving only arising from conditions as the only valid option.

Those who do not see this point do not understand either Nāgārjuna or Candrakīrti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

(glossed by Candrakīrti as "completely deluded")

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakīrti says:

ཡང་དག་མཐོང་ཡུལ་གང་དེ་དེ་ཉིད་དེ།
མཐོང་བ་བརྒྱན་པ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་བདན་པར་གསུངས།
མཐོང་བ་བརྒྱན་པ་འང་རྣམ་པ་གཉིས་འདྲོད་དེ།
དབང་པོ་གསལ་དང་དབང་པོ་སྒྱུན་ཟན་ནོ།

That object which is correctly seen is true,

that falsely seen is said to be relative truth.

Also false seeing is held to be of two kinds:

a non-defective sense organ and a defective sense organ.

He also says:

ཁྱེན་ལས་བྱང་མེད་ཁམས་གསུམ་པོ།
འདུས་བྱས་ཡིན་པར་ངེས་པར་བསྟན།
དེ་ནི་དེ་ཡིས་སྟངས་ཉིད་གང་།
དེ་ནི་འདུས་བྱས་སྟངས་ཉིད་གསུངས།

Because of arising from conditions,
the three realms are conventionally ascertained to be conditioned.
That [the three realms] which is empty of that [the inherent existence of the three realms];
that is said to be the emptiness of the conditioned.

In this case, all that the three realms are empty of here is inherent existence, here termed "the emptiness of the conditioned".

But what they are not empty of, according to Candrakīrti, is being conventionally designated as "conditioned" since the three realms are observed to arise from conditions.

Thus, your thesis that Nāgārjuna rejects arising conventionally is not to be found in the thought of Candrakīrti, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 26th, 2013 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gaden chopel said:

Causation is deconstructed in chapter 1 of MMK.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, yes; conventionally no, as passages by Buddhapaṇḍita and Candrakīrti demonstrated quite clearly.

You can deconstruct the two truths if you like, and certainly the two truths are rejected in Dzogchen; but not in Madhyamaka. And conventional truth in Madhyamaka clearly demonstrates the need for causation in order to have a sensible world where everything does not arise from everything at random.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

In that way they will avoid the anthropomorphism which is implied by using the term "neurons".

Malcolm wrote:

I think the term you are looking for is not anthropomorphism, but rather, "zoomorphism", if we are going to be fussy about terms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Ditto on the attitude.

Malcolm wrote:

Your habitually hostile tone has been mentioned many times, by many people. You usually defend it saying "That's just how I am....".

People say many things about me, but they never call me "hostile". They usually just say I am a bully, or a fundamentalist (), and then only when they haven't anything substantive with which to back up their argument.

Anyway

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

tingdzin said:

1 Sri Singha was born in China -- any of the biographies that gives a birthplace says this.

Malcolm wrote:

The sole source for this attribution is the lo rgyus chen mo by Zhang ston. This text is quite late, and seems wholly fictional apart from some details borrowed from earlier accounts of Vairocana's adventures in India, as well as sharing details of Garab Dorje's birth as well as Manjuśrimitra. None of the details of his life ever place him anywhere outside of the region of Bodhgaya in any pre-sNying thig accounts. I am not aware of any pre sNying thig text that places Śrī Singha outside of India.

tingdzin said:

His birthplace is specified as So khyam, which through comparative historical linguistics and the accounts of later Tibetan histories, which do not mention Sri Singha at all, can be identified with the Chinese district of Suo fang. This does not mean Khotan

-- I've seen that silliness several times and don't know how it got started. Nor does it mean Sri Singha was ethnic Chinese -- Suo fang, though part of the T'ang Empire, fell squarely into what was called the Sogdian (hu) prefectures, because they were populated by Sogdians, an Iranic-speaking people from present-day Uzbekistan (who had a lot of influence on early Chinese Buddhism, by the way). Sri Singha was supposed to have studied in his early life at Wu T'ai Shan, very close to Suo fang.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all very interesting but none of this shows that in fact Shri Singha was Sogdian, it is not impossible, but it is not certain. Such an account is utterly lacking in the accounts of the bodhicitta texts and the vajra bridge instructions.

tingdzin said:

2 If you say that Uddiyana fell within the Indian sphere of cultural influence, I would ask you: where did that sphere stop?

Malcolm wrote:

Northwards, think we can define it to be within the region covered by the Mauryan Empire, which definitely covers all areas which can be defined as Gandhara as well as Oḍḍiyāna. Apart from Shri Lanka, Buddhism never really penetrated the deep southern portion of the subcontinent, which is accounted for by the fact that Mauryan Empire never stretched that far. We can see the influence of the Roman Empire on the map of the world even today, so such a long standing network of trade and kinships that were set up during the Maurya can be considered to have endured for hundreds of years after the fall of the Mauryan empire itself.

A note: there is a passage that records the fact that Oḍḍiyāna is a country that no longer exists in the world in the long Vajra Bridge lo rgyus.

As far as Buddhism beyond this region [Khotan, etc.], I think it is fair to consider that these are also "Indian" Buddhisms in so far as their Buddhism was of the export variety. As we know, oft times exports cannot be found at home.

tingdzin said:

3) When you sat that Buddhist Dzogchen was entirely Indic-Buddhist inspired, that is still quite hotly debated, as you, being pretty au courant with modern scholarship, must know.

Malcolm wrote:

Apart from some Chan influence [very debatable] which also has Indian roots, I see no reason to doubt otherwise.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Thank you VERY much for your effort. But this begs the question: why did you state earlier that you have not seen any texts that refer to Mahamudra as primordial when you are the translator of a text that points out that it is primordial?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is typically divided into three: basis, path and result. The Mahāmudra dohas treat all three. Take the passage:

All sentient beings are emanations of mahamudra,
the essence of those emanations is the forever non-arising dharmadhatu,
also all characteristics of dualistic appearances, happiness, suffering and so on,
are the play of mahamudra, the original dharmata.

This is not generally regarded as a statement concerning primordial buddhahood, it is generally considered to be a statement of concerning the cause continuum (rgyu rgyud).

In Mahāmudra traditions the basis is regarded as "the cause", not the result. When implanted with the seed of the ripening empowerment and the liberating instructions, the path produces a result.

The main difference is one of terminology. Everyone agrees [apart from the Bonpos] that Mahāmudra and Dzogchen provide the same buddhahood, differing primarily in how the basis and the path is presented.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

If it means something like the aggregates of a given moment "depend" on the "previous" moment's, that only raises more questions for me.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is what is meant. It's very clearly stated in the passage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

"Yes, plants have both short- and long-term electrical signalling, and they use some neurotransmitter-like chemicals as chemical signals," Lincoln Taiz, an emeritus

professor of plant physiology at U.C. Santa Cruz and one of the signers of the Alpi letter, told me. "But the mechanisms are quite different from those of true nervous systems." Taiz says that the writings of the plant neurobiologists suffer from "over-interpretation of data, teleology, anthropomorphizing, philosophizing, and wild speculations."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, thanks, I read the article quite closely.

The article is about plant neurobiology. Some people, like yourself, might take issue with the term since plants do not have "neurons", but they clearly have information processing capacities and cells that appear homologous with neurons, as the article also suggests.

You might also work on the attitude.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, actually he is just paraphrasing Nāgārjuna's Pratītyasamutpāḍakārika:

...Although the aggregates are serially connected...

dzogchungpa said:

I don't really understand what "serially connected" means.

Malcolm wrote:

The aggregates of this life form a series connected with aggregates of the past life, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The subject of the discussion is plant neurobiology and, like I said, plants do not have neurons so the thread title is WRONG.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the subject of the discussion is the Pollen article, and therefore the title is correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Where did I refute "intelligence"? Where did I equate "intelligence" with a brain?

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't talking about you specifically. It is true that I practice Buddhadharma, not "Buddhism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

smcj said:

It's the same for Dzogchen, and most other dharma systems.

"At no time throughout the beginningless succession of lifetimes has there ever been an actual birth. There has only been the appearance of birth. There has never been actual death, only the transformation of appearances like the shift from the dream state to the waking state... throughout the beginningless succession of lifetimes there has never been any actual experience of transition or going from one state to another, or any actual experience of being located in some other place. This is analogous to the images in a dream."

- Longchenpa

Most Dharma systems are sailing manuals to "the other shore". Longchenpa speaks from the perspective of having gotten out of the boat after having reached "the other shore".

Malcolm wrote:

Well, actually he is just paraphrasing Nāgārjuna's Pratītyasamutpāḍakārika:

Empty dharmas are entirely produced
from dharmas strictly empty;
dharmas without a self and [not] of a self.
Words, butter lamps, mirrors, seals,
fire crystals, seeds, sourness and echoes.
Although the aggregates are serially connected,
the wise are to comprehend nothing has transferred.
Someone, having conceived of annihilation,
even in extremely subtle existents,
he is not wise,
and will never see the meaning of 'arisen from conditions'.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Neurobiology is a misleading term here. Plants do not have neurons. That is not to deny that some sort of biofeedback system is at work here, but it is not neurological.

Malcolm wrote:

“Metaphors help stimulate the investigative imagination of good scientists,” the British plant scientist Anthony Trewavas wrote in a spirited response to the Alpi letter denouncing plant neurobiology. “Plant neurobiology” is obviously a metaphor—plants don’t possess the type of excitable, communicative cells we call neurons. Yet the introduction of the term has raised a series of questions and inspired a set of experiments that promise to deepen our understanding not only of plants but potentially also of brains. If there are other ways of processing information, other kinds of cells and cell networks that can somehow give rise to intelligent behavior, then we may be more inclined to ask, with Mancuso, “What’s so special about neurons?”

And:

Most definitions of intelligence fall into one of two categories. The first is worded so that intelligence requires a brain; the definition refers to intrinsic mental qualities such as reason, judgment, and abstract thought. The second category, less brain-bound and metaphysical, stresses behavior, defining intelligence as the ability to respond in optimal ways to the challenges presented by one’s environment and circumstances. Not surprisingly, the plant neurobiologists jump into this second camp.

Frankly it is hilarious to see Buddhists refute the intelligence of plants on the one hand, and insist on the other that a mind cannot be reduced to a brain on the other...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Understanding the Abhidharmakosa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Kosha's verses, true, are based on Sarvāstivādin; the the bhaṣyaṃ is Sautrantika.

daverupa said:

Sure, but I hadn't seen the bhaṣyam mentioned yet so had not commented with it in mind.

Malcolm wrote:

The two are inseparable, i.e. the one is always studied with the other.

daverupa said:

Well, Indian Buddhadharma covers more chronology than the last 800 years; the Abhidharmakosa is not a castle built in the sky. It is a trenchant summary position from within scholastic Buddhism, which may or may not matter to the OP, but there it is.

Malcolm wrote:

The beauty of the Kosha is that it covers pretty much every major Abhidharma trend until the fifth century, based as it is in the Mahāvibhāṣa, etc. Abhidharma is a different thing, and was largely irrelevant to continental Buddhadharma and remains so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 25th, 2013 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

daverupa said:

Be wary of false dichotomies; big cities are just as natural as anthills.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

padma norbu said:

Shared that with one person who immediately concluded it was proof of God designing it.

Malcolm wrote:

Confirmation bias...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Understanding the Abhidharmakosa

Content:

daverupa said:

It presents the general anatomy and physiology of Sarvāstivādin Buddhadharma ca. 4th-5th century CE.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this not exactly true. The Kosha's verses, true, are based on Sarvāstivādin; the the bhaṣyaṃ is Sautrantika.

In any event, it was the major Abhidharma text on the subcontinent for the last 800 years of Buddhadharma's presence on the subcontinent. If someone wants to understand Indian Buddhadharma's basics, the Kosha is the go to text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Understanding the Abhidharmakosa

Content:

dimeo said:

Can anyone give a general comment as to what is profound about this book that Buddhists appreciate and have studied it for so many centuries? Anyone have any insight on this text to share?

Malcolm wrote:

It presents the general anatomy and physiology of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 11:19 PM

Title: Plant Neurobiology

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They injected fir trees with radioactive carbon isotopes, then followed the spread of the isotopes through the forest community using a variety of sensing methods, including a Geiger counter. Within a few days, stores of radioactive carbon had been routed from tree to tree. Every tree in a plot thirty metres square was connected to the network; the oldest trees functioned as hubs, some with as many as forty-seven connections. The diagram of the forest network resembled an airline route map.

The pattern of nutrient traffic showed how “mother trees” were using the network to nourish shaded seedlings, including their offspring—which the trees can apparently recognize as kin—until they’re tall enough to reach the light. And, in a striking example of interspecies coöperation, Simard found that fir trees were using the fungal web to trade nutrients with paper-bark birch trees over the course of the season. The evergreen species will tide over the deciduous one when it has sugars to spare, and then call in the debt later in the season. For the forest community, the value of this coöperative underground economy appears to be better over-all health, more total photosynthesis, and greater resilience in the face of disturbance.

In his talk, Mancuso juxtaposed a slide of the nodes and links in one of these subterranean forest networks with a diagram of the Internet, and suggested that in some respects the former was superior. “Plants are able to create scalable networks of self-maintaining, self-operating, and self-repairing units,” he said. “Plants.”

http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2013/12/23/131223fa_fact_pollan?currentPage=all

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Malcolm, should the rig pa rang shar quote say "the dharmatā free from extremes"? Or is "the Dharma free from extremes" correct in this context?

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma is correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Malcolm's idea of causes and conditions existing conventionally? Gelugpa.

Malcolm wrote:

As Candra points out in the Prasannapāda:

Therefore, that being the case, here when the Bhagavan clarified the production of things depending on cause and condition, he refuted the production of things causelessly, from a single cause, a dissimilar cause, or generated by self and other. Since those were refuted, the intrinsic nature of relative things was taught according to how they exist relatively.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

all you can say is that you have seen something you call a sprout appearing where previously you have seen a seed. There is no demonstrable causal relation between them, on that both Nagarjuna and Hume agree.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they do not agree. Hume, a materialist, is rejecting causal necessity conventionally.

Nāgārjuna, a Buddhist, is only rejecting arising ultimately/intrinsically.

This does not establish causality at all except as a proliferation, plain and simple. For example, in the Pratītyasamutpāḍakarikāvhyākhyana, Nāgārjuna states in reply to a question:

Question: Nevertheless, who is the lord of all, creating sentient beings, who is their creator?

Reply: All living beings are causes and results.

As an example of Nāgārjuna maintaining conventional causality conventionally states in the same text:

Therein, the aggregates are the aggregates of matter, sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness. Those, called 'serially joined', not having ceased, produce another produced from that cause; although not even the subtle atom of an existent has transmigrated from this world to the next.

gad rgyangs said:

plucking one member of the tetralemma out this way results in the most egregious misreading I think I have ever seen of this passage. "Arising without a cause" is not refuted to demonstrate that causes and conditions exist conventionally, it is refuted because nothing at all arises, period.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a tetralemma, there is no fourth member. The third argument "Nothing...arises without a cause" serves to eliminate the idea that conventionally anything can arise from anything, as Buddhapaḥita, etc. clearly explain in their commentaries.

Remember, when we are discussing conventionalities such as causality and arising, we are not doing so from the perspective of how things actually are, we are speaking strictly from the perspective of conventional truth. Buddhapaḥita at the end of the first chapter says "Because results, conditions, and non-conditions do not exist, descriptions for arising are merely conventional." No Madhyamaka maintains "There is no arising in conventional truth".

Now you may prefer Hume to Nāgārjuna, but don't conflate Hume's materialism with Nāgārjuna's presentation of ultimate truth.

In fact, in every commentary around 13.6 preserves the necessity of a relationship between causes and their effects, i.e. asserting that from a Madhyamaka point of view, causal connection is necessary, for example, demonstrating how curd does not come from water because curd indeed comes from milk even though causes and effects can not be said to be the same nor different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The arising of appearances needs to be explained in some way, hence MMK 1.1

gad rgyangs said:

but they can't be explained, that's just the point.

Malcolm wrote:

They can indeed be explained.

gad rgyangs said:

The Madhyamaka project is to show that as long as one insists that there is an ultimate basis of imputation beyond mere appearances hang on, I thought appearances are the imputations?

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that. Not even once.

gad rgyangs said:

In the end it is very simple, this appearance, for example a sprout, depends on the appearance of that appearance, for example a seed; without the seed there is no sprout. This appearance, butter, depends on that appearance, milk., etc. this is just crypto-causality.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing crypto about it. It is causality, plain and simple.

gad rgyangs said:

Dependent origination serves to explain causal processes without invoking essences. causal processes are refuted in 1.1: there aren't any

Malcolm wrote:

They are not refuted conventionally in MMK 1.1.

"Nothing...arises without a cause..."

As Buddhapalita explains:

Also they do not arise without a cause, because the consequence would be that

everything arising from everything permanently, and because there would be the fallacy of the purposelessness of all undertakings. Why is that so? Because the arising of existents is not accepted in all aspects, therefore, because there is no arising, the expression 'arising' is just a convention.

So even while we can refute arising ultimately, we must accept causes conventionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Appearances are mere percepts: colors, shapes, sounds, smells, etc. Everything else is conceptual overlay.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you have reduced your view to that of the Carvaka materialists who accept only direct perception as authorities.

That's ok with me, but it is not Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Hanuman in Vajrayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Perhaps this is getting off topic and maybe we could start a new thread, but I am also very interested in the idea of local protectors. Does anyone have any more stories of lamas recognizing their presence outside of Tibet?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really necessary to give them names. Bhūmipatis is the general designation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 24th, 2013 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

I give up. If you think it is necessary to accept the idea of a self in order to teach the absence of a self I just don't agree with that.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha very clearly taught both self and not-self, depending on context.

heart said:
Yeah, right. you keep telling me that.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Nāgārjuna states:

Though a so called "self" is designated,
also non-self was taught;
The buddhas have also said
"there is no self or nonself at all"

The commentary by Buddhapalita explains that Buddhas teach the existence of a self in order to prevent beings from falling into lower realms because they will then ignore the effects of positive and negative actions. Nonself is taught in order to counter attachment to samsara in general and to higher realms specifically. But, he adds, this two are illusions taught to guide the immature. Buddhapalita states that In reality, the buddhas teach neither self nor nonself.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 10:46 PM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
appearances are a given, dependent arising is a concept. how can they be two sides of an "equation"? In that sense, dependent origination is itself an imputation made on the bases of appearances. If Madhymaka claims that the quieting of proliferations is a desideratum, why doesn't it start with itself?

In the end, Madhyamaka says exactly nothing, only that you can impute whatever you want on whatever you want. This is helpful how exactly?

Malcolm wrote:
As Rongzom points out, only Madhyamaka "harms" itself.

The arising of appearances needs to explained in some way, hence MMK 1.1

At no time, no where
do things arise from self,
from other,
or without a cause.

Madhyamaka serves to pacify proliferation through demonstrating dependent origination. This is the mangalam of MMK states that dependent origination, unceasing, non-arising, etc., is the pacification of proliferation.

From your given appearance, one might explain appearances arise causelessly [Carvaka], or from themselves [Sāṃkhya], from other [Vaiśeṣika], etc.

Nāgārjuna's project is twofold: one, to show that accounts of apparent phenomena other than dependent origination are unintelligible. Two, to show that dependently originated phenomena are empty.

He does this because of the subject/predicate [dharmin/dharmatā] problem in discussing phenomena in terms of essences. The dharmin in this case is appearances which are dependently arising. When their predicate is sought, their dharmatā, it is found to be emptiness.

Since phenomena are found to be essenceless, they are likened to appearances that everyone accepts are unreal, i.e. illusions, apparitions, space and so on.

The Madhyamaka project is to show that as long as one insists that there is an ultimate basis of imputation beyond mere appearances, for that long one will be locked into conceptuality. Since in the final analysis, one can find no basis of imputation at all, and since the object under analysis ceases to appear as either an existent or in this case as a non-existent (since a non-existent cannot be predicated without an existent), one ceases to conceive of things as existents or nonexistents. That is the desiderata.

In the end it is very simple, this appearance, for example a sprout, depends on the appearance of that appearance, for example a seed; without the seed there is no sprout. This appearance, butter, depends on that appearance, milk., etc.

Dependent origination serves to explain causal processes without invoking essences. Dependent origination is something one can witness with one's own eyes, so in that sense it is not imputation, it is how things exist. In other words, at no time has anyone ever witnessed the arising of something that did not depend on a cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Hanuman in Vajrayana

Content:

Destiny said:

As far I know, there are a few secret mantras practiced in tantric sadhanas, but the common hindu mantras don't require any transmission.

It is very, very different from Vajrayana.

Actually, it is also possible to perform homa (fire puja) to hindu gods without any initiations. You can even find instructions to do that online

I don't know anyway if this kind of practices are recommended from a buddhist point of view. Probably, if the specific god is recognized as a buddhist protector it would be fine.

Malcolm wrote:

There are, according to my yoga teacher Srivatsa Ramaswami, three kinds of "Hindu" mantras; vedic mantras, bija mantras (tantric) and loka mantras (puranic). The last do not require any sort of transmission, the first two do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

I give up. If you think it is necessary to accept the idea of a self in order to teach the absence of a self I just don't agree with that.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha very clearly taught both self and not-self, depending on context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I'm not asking about first causes, but rather bases of imputation in the Madhyamaka view. The whole magical person thing is bogus & irrelevant, as I have shown.

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained this: the basis of imputation is an appearance. Some trends on Madhyamaka then assert that appearances are mind. Since appearances/mind are not findable on analysis, they/it are equated with illusion. Illusions lack any inherent nature because they are dependent originations. Dependent originations are free from extremes and, in the final analysis, inexpressible. None of this is circular in anyway.

You ask, what dependently arises -- we can say all kinds of things, but in the end, it boils down to appearance. What are appearances? Dependent arisings. What dependently arises? Appearances. This is not a circularity, it is an equation appearances = dependent origination.

If you want to be more specific you can say what appearance? A rope or a car, for example. Upon what is a rope designated? It's parts. Upon what are the parts designated? Their parts, if they have any. If they do not have further parts, then they are designated upon moments, etc., until one runs out of bases of imputation. At that point,

you have [intellectually] discovered emptiness, i.e., the absence of a ultimate or final basis of designation. At each stage of the analysis the previous basis of imputation no longer appears since it has been deconstructed. As Shantideva points out:

When an existent or a nonexistent
does not exist in the presence of the mind,
at that time since there is no other aspect
[concepts] are fully pacified as there is no objective support [dmigs pa, ālambana].

gad rgyangs said:
yes, rigpa resolves all questions about the nature of reality, but there ain't no rigpa in Madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:
Actually, Shantideva's quote above shows that there is vidyā in Madhyamaka, as the Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra states:

The Dharma free from the extremes of conceptual grasping.
is directly perceived without dwelling on an object.

These two statements should be understood to have the same import.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 1:03 PM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
where, and by whom, has it been demonstrated that magical people exist at all or can or cannot interact? And why should this prove that an empty statement can refute a statement claiming substance?

Malcolm wrote:
This is why N gives the example of illusions, etc., over and over again. That is point of the example from V. Emanational people can hinder other emanational people, since they can generate them. Since all statements are in fact empty, empty statements can rebut empty statements that assert substantiality.

gad rgyangs said:
here is a simile with no referent, unless Teacher (meaning of course, the Buddha) is a creator god. If we, as agents are magical beings and so are our actions, then who is the one that creates these magical beings in the way that the Buddha creates chains of magical beings?

Malcolm wrote:
You are asking an irrelevant question.

It is axiomatic in Buddhadharma that there are no first causes. The very notion of pratyasamutpada forbids the notion of any first cause, or creator, etc.

You might imagine you have found an answer in "rig pa", but vidyā just means knowledge of the basis, etc., and it is also baseless and essenceless as well. Keep going where your going and you are going to wind up in new age la la land.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 12:55 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It's very simple:

"Where this exists, that exists. With the arising of that, this arises...."

Since we cannot in the end find anything but appearances that are found on examination to be empty, all we are left with is appearances that arise in dependence upon other appearances. For example, like an emanational person who generates further emanational persons as stated in the Vighavyāvartanivṛtti passage I provided above.

gad rgyangs said:

the concept of emanational/artificial/magical people is first raised in the V by the opponent, to say that N's empty statement cannot refute his claims for svabhava in the same way that one purportedly artificial person cannot hinder another. N replies that an artificial person can indeed hinder another, so his empty statement can refute the opponent's substantial one: "Therefore in just the same way the negation of the substance of thing is established by my empty speech". The opponent is retarded to raise the issue at all, but N's reply is no better: where, and by whom, has it been demonstrated that magical people exist at all or can or cannot interact? And why should this prove that an empty statement can refute a statement claiming substance?

However, in MMK 17.31-32 N says,

"Just as the Teacher by his supernatural power fabricates a magical being that in turn fabricates yet another magical being,
so with regard to the agent, which has the form of a magical being, and the action that is done by it,
it is like the case where a second magical being is fabricated by a magical being."

here is a simile with no referent, unless Teacher (meaning of course, the Buddha) is a creator god. If we, as agents are magical beings and so are our actions, then who is the one that creates these magical beings in the way that the Buddha creates chains of magical beings?

imputations require ropes and magical beings require magicians.

Malcolm wrote:

You are chasing a first cause down a rabbit hole. Blue pill or red pill?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 12:50 PM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Sherab Rigdrol said:

Is there a relationship between Shiva and Chenrezig?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Avalokiteshvara is held to have converted Shiva in the Karandavyuha sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 12:06 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

me: "and appearances are what?"

thee: "Dependent arisings."

me : "dependent arisings of what?"

thee: "Of appearances..."

dude...

Malcolm wrote:

It's very simple:

"Where this exists, that exists. With the arising of that, this arises...."

Since we cannot in the end find anything but appearances that are found on examination to be empty, all we are left with is appearances that arise in dependence upon other appearances. For example, like an emanational person who generates further emanational persons as stated in the Vigrahavyāvartanīvr̥tti passage I provided above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 12:01 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

smcj said:

I personally think 'dependent arising' is better rendered as 'interdependent arising', which is even better rendered into simple language as 'paradox'.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "inter" in pratītyasamutpada

A more literal translation is "conditioned co-origination", where pratitya bears the sense of pratyaya, i.e. conditioned.

The tibetan "rten cing 'brel bar 'byung ba" means something like "dependent and relational origination".

There is however nothing "paradoxical" about dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 11:52 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

smcj said:

I wouldn't say so. Nāgārjuna's entire exposition concerns what occurs after the basis isn't recognized in Dzogchen.

I would tend to agree with you, but a Gelugpa would not accept the idea of a "basis" at all. Once you say that there is a "basis", no matter how you define or don't define it, you've left Nagarjuna behind--unless you accept "In Praise of Dharmadhātu" as authored by Nagarjuna.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily. Gelugpas accept the dharmadhātu, therefore, they accept a basis. For example, they accept the Āryākṣayamatīrdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra as definitive. It states:

If it is asked what is the bodhisattva's skill in the elements [kṛams, dhātu], it is that which is the wisdom that engages the dharmadhātu. The dharmadhātu is the element of earth, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of solidity. The dharmadhātu is the element of water, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of wetness. The dharmadhātu is the element of fire, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of maturation. The dharmadhātu is the element of air, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of motility. The dharmadhātu is the element of the eye, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of sight...The dharmadhātu is the element of the body, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of touch. The dharmadhātu is the element of mind, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of perception [vijñāpti]. The dharmadhātu is the element of eye consciousness, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of of the specific perception of form...The dharmadhātu is the element of form, but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of the element of perception of an

eye consciousness. The dharmadhātu is the element of phenomena [chos kyi khams, dharma dhātu, one of the eighteen dhātus], but the dharmadhātu is not the characteristic of the perception of phenomena...the dharmadhātu and the element of the self are the same. The dharmadhātu, the desire realm, form realm and formless realm are the same. The dharmadhātu and the element of samsara and the element of nirvana are the same. The dharmadhātu, the element of sentient beings the element of space and the element of all phenomena, those are the same. If it is asked why they are the same, because they are the same as emptiness, they are the same. This is the basis any Gelugpa can accept.

This sutra also has a beautiful definition of wisdom as well:

If it is asked what is consciousness [vijñāna] and what is wisdom [jñāna], so called "consciousness" are the four abodes of consciousness. If it is asked what four, it is as follows: consciousness approaches matter, approaches sensation, approaches perception [samjñā] and approaches formations and abides. This is called "consciousness". If it is asked what is wisdom, whatever thoroughly knows the aggregate of consciousness in the four aggregates, this is called "wisdom". Moreover, consciousness is the earth element consciousness, the water element, the fire element and air element consciousness. This is called "consciousness". Whatever knows the consciousness that abides in these four elements to be inseparable with the dharmadhātu, this is called "wisdom".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:
and appearances are what?

Malcolm wrote:
Dependent arisings.

gad rgyangs said:
dependent arisings of what?

Malcolm wrote:
Of appearances...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Destiny said:

In general, in the White Mahākala sadhana of Shangpa there is only one Ganapati. In the sadhana I have there are two Tso Daks. Also in the pictures one can find online one usually sees two Tso Daks. That's why I was confused and thought that Tso Dak was not exactly Ganesh, but something like a class of beings linked to him.

Malcolm wrote:

In the sadhana I have practiced on and off for the past 25 years there is only one. There must be a slight difference in lineage. I received through the Sakyapa school where it is a major wealth practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

and appearances are what?

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent arisings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

smcj said:

Dudjom R. subscribes to the 3rd turning as definitive. You are more than welcome to follow ChNN's lead on this, but his opinion is not universally held.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither is Dudjom Rinpoche's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Destiny said:

Is there a similar sadhana in other lineages (ex. Shangpa) where one takes the form of Gonkar/White Mahakala while commanding Ganapati?

I'm asking this questions because of a dream i had last night.

Tshogs bdag is Tibetan for Ganapati.

If they are exactly the same thing, why in the sadhana of Gonkar there are 2 (two) Tso Daks under the feet of Gonkar? In the sadhana I have, these Tso Daks are also called "Lords of Demons".

I'm also interested to know if we can consider these Ganapatis part of Gonkar's worldly entourage. In that case the tormas would be offered to them, also.

Malcolm wrote:

As for your first question, as far as I know, no.

Tshogs = gana

bdag = pati.

In general, in the White Mahākāla sadhana of Shangpa there is only one Ganapati.

Lords of Demons is an alternate name for Ganesh/Ganapati i.e. Vinayaka.

No need to offer tormas to Ganapati in White Mahakāla sadhana.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Either way, Dzogpa Chenpo never advocates for a substantial existence.

smcj said:

Neither does Great Madhyamaka advocate for a "substantial" existence. As I quoted Samba as saying on p. 19 of this thread, "the ineffable ground that is also empty (but not empti-ness-a-thing)" is a restating of the Great Madhyamak view.

Malcolm wrote:

It is sort of ridiculous to term gzhan stong "great madhyamaka" since it is a term used to describe several different positions amongst Tibetan Madhyamakas i.e. gzhan stong; the early Sakya/Nyingma view of free from extremes that goes right back to Kawa Paltseg, and of course Tsongkhapa's formulation.

The Indian texts also show no consistency in how the term is used, the anonymous pramāṇavidhvaṃsanaṭippīṭakavṛtti refers to its adherents as "great madhyamaka" and rejects the so called cittamatra madhyamaka [that Bhava advocates in the passage you reference] as inferior.

In reality, in the Indian context, "great madhyamaka" is a term mostly used in tantric

treatises; even here however it is used in various different ways. The Śrī-kālacakropadeśayogaṣaḍaṅgatantrapañjikā by Avadhutipāda states: "The nature of the completion [stage] is said to be mahāmadhyamaka". On other hand, the Śrī-ḍākārṇavamahāyoginītantrarājasyaṭikāvohitaṭikā by Padmavajra states: So called "madhyamaka" is the dharma of the essence, the freedom from four extremes of the mahāmadhyamaka of the Mahāyāna and the awakening of the fortunate. Dombi Heruka's Śrīhevajrasādhana states: One should mediate on the great madhyamaka free from all signs. And the Tantric Candrakīrti's Samājābhīsamayālamkāravṛtti states Having manifested the mahāmadhyamaka that is like space, the sunlight of compassion benefits all sentient beings

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

smcj said:

Dudjom Rinpoche stated that it's acceptable to hold a gzhan stong view in certain circumstances regarding practice. I believe he then also stated that in post-meditation and in instances where discussion/debate was occurring, the rang stong view is appropriate.

I believe what D.R. said was that Prasāngika view is best if the subject of emptiness is approached intellectually, and Great Madhyamaka view is best if the subject of emptiness is approached from an experiential/meditational perspective. He calls the Prasāngika the "coarse outer Madhyamaka" as opposed to the "subtle inner Madhyamaka". He subscribes to the 3rd turning as definitive. I've got the quote(s) somewhere in the Big Red Book. I will look them up if you so desire.

Malcolm wrote:

I have already shown that this distinction made by many gzhan stong scholars is based on a misconception, and I even trotted out the passage in question.

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=102&t=13306&p=174083&hilit=outer+madhyamaka#p174083>

So called subtle inner Madhyamaka is just taking appearances to be mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Ganesh in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Destiny said:

'Oh Ananda, when any son of noble family, daughter of noble family, monk, nun, lay man or lay woman goes to a place of worship other than where the Three Jewels (are

worshipped) or enters the palace retinue of a king and practices the mantras (recited in that place) and begins with this Essence of Ganapati-Ganesvara all one's tasks will be accomplished. Have no doubts about it.

Can someone clarify this statement ? Does that mean that by using that mantra, any other non-buddhist mantras become buddhist and brings realization?

I have another question: there is a clear connection between White Mahakala (Gonkar) and Ganesh - or at least that's what I've understood.

If one practice white mahakala sadhana, do you think that if one recite the usual ganesh mantra (om gam ganapataye namaha) his practice will be enhanced?

And what is the connection between the Tso Dak that are under Gonkar's feet and Ganapati? To be more precise, what are the tso dak and their role in Vajrayana buddhism?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

The answer to your first question is no.

Tshogs bdag is Tibetan for Ganapati.

Ganapati is a mundane protector in Tibetan Buddhism. For example, in the Red Ganapati practice transmitted in Sakya, oneself in the form of Vajrapani commands Ganapati to perform one's wishes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

how can aggregates, or anything else, be posited on emptiness? "Emptiness" is not a res.

Malcolm wrote:

"For those whom emptiness is possible, for them everything is possible; for those whom emptiness is not possible, for them nothing is possible."

gad rgyangs said:

sure, but that does not address the fact that the traditional presentation of imputation requires a rope first. Im sure thats why paratantra was made up. you can break it down to atoms, but what is the "rope" that atoms are imputed on?

Malcolm wrote:

The atoms are not imputed upon a rope. When the atoms are perceived, the rope no longer appears, just as when the rope is perceived, the snake no longer appears. As I mentioned above, all of these things are imputed upon appearances. When you run out of appearances, i.e. when you cannot find anything more, you run out of imputations -- hence emptiness. This is all very straightforward.

Yogacara assumes that mind is a basis for everything, hence their paratantra concept.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ok so if we mistake the aggregates for a "self", then what is it we are mistaking as "aggregates"?

Malcolm wrote:

snake = self

rope = aggregates

atoms/moments= constituents of aggregates

Keep breaking it down, you arrive at emptiness.

gad rgyangs said:

how can aggregates, or anything else, be posited on emptiness? "Emptiness" is not a res.

Malcolm wrote:

"For those whom emptiness is possible, for them everything is possible; for those whom emptiness is not possible, for them nothing is possible."

In any event, the main point is that these things are appearances. So the real answer to your question is that all of these things such as aggregates, etc., are posited upon appearances. These appearances are dependently arisen. Since they are dependently arisen, they are empty. That is the best you are going to get out of Madhyamaka, hence the two truths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 23rd, 2013 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if the self is posited on the aggregates, then what are the aggregates posited on? And no infinite regress please.

The point here is that it is not actually posited on the aggregates. But conventionally designated as the aggregates. That is to say, when people [falsely] impute a self, they do so in relation to the aggregates.

༥ རྒྱལ་སྤྱོད་ཀྱི་རྩིས་འབྲུག་པུན་མཆོག་གི་ཕྱིར་འོང་བར་བྱེད་པ་ལ་འགོག་པར་བྱེད་པ་དང་།
རྒྱལ་ཡོན་ལྷན་ཁྲིམས་ཀྱི་ཕྱིར་འོང་བར་བྱེད་པ་ལ་འགོག་པར་བྱེད་པ་བཅིང་། དེ་ལྟར་ཞུས་པའི་སྐབས་ཀྱི་དགག་པར་བྱ

བཀའ་ལན་པ་ དེ་ཡང་རྟོང་བ་ཡིན།

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if the self is posited on the aggregates, then what are the aggregates posited on? And no infinite regress please.

Malcolm wrote:

Matter, mind and mental factors: dharmas the Abhidharmikas took to be pāramārtha dharmas.

They posit the material aggregate upon the four elements which make up one's sense organs and their objects. Sensation, perception and formations are posited upon mental factors. The aggregate of consciousness is posited on past (manas), present (vijñāna) and future (citta) minds.

Matter is then posited on particles (described in various ways). Mind and mental factors are posited upon moments.

At this point the whole system becomes realist. The corrective for that is the two truths as presented in Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

dude said:

what's important is instruction.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

dude said:

I'm talking about the Buddha's teachings themselves, not academic speculation on events.

Malcolm wrote:
Which Buddha's teaching?

dude said:
THE Buddha's teaching.
In the Nirvana Sutra, the Buddha said that supernatural powers aren't really important, what's important is instruction.

Malcolm wrote:
There are lots of Buddhas.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 10:11 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
Sherab Rigdrol said:
I don't need a person obsessed with building a grandiose reputation as a scholar and researcher to explain it to me in terms that are less than several hundred years old.

Malcolm wrote:
Which person would that be?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
Sherab Rigdrol said:
Modern practitioner here who prefers so-called Tibetan myth and supernaturalism's explanation of reality to modern science's narcissistic and limited temporal conclusions.

Malcolm wrote:
Why narcissistic?

And yes, people need certainty in their lives-- some seek it in science, others in religion; but certainty is found in neither.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 9:11 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

dude said:

I'm talking about the Buddha's teachings themselves, not academic speculation on events.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddha's teaching?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: Sexism in Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

The Tara's are of course. However I have a tale for you: one day Naropa was sitting outside the gate at his monastic university reading a parjnaparamita text. An aged hag come up and asked, do you understand what you are reading? Naropa answered, yes, I understand the words. The hag danced for joy. Then Naropa said "I also understand the meaning." Whereupon the hag wept bitterly.....

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Use of the word "hag" indicates again patriarchal expectations around female beauty, availability and desirability, in this case, Western ones since the word "hag" does not exist in Tibetan.

hag 1 |hag|

noun

1 a witch, esp. one in the form of an ugly old woman (often used as a term of disparagement for a woman): a fat old hag in a dirty apron.

In the original text by Tsang Nyon Heruka, she is simply described as an old women (rgan mo) with thirty seven signs of ugliness.

kirtu said:

Thank-you. Of course most people recounting the tale do not say "There is no word for 'hag' in Tibetan and Tsang Nyon Heruka, simply described her as an old women (rgan mo) with thirty seven signs of ugliness." This is almost always translated as "hag" and then perhaps it's mentioned that she was ugly as well as old.

Malcolm wrote:

"rgan mo" is virtually never translated as hag, and the native Tibetan dictionaries simple describes a "rgan mo" as "a women who is "high" in years" [lo na mtho ba'i bud med]. In

this case the translator [Guenther] took license with the Tibetan text in an unfortunate way, looking to make the text more "dramatic".

kirtu said:

The whole use of the term is to counter patriarchal conditioning as the old woman in the story is Vajrayogini appearing to Naropa (for those playing at home). The fully enlightened being appeared in a form counter to Naropa's patriarchal expectations. And this is the lesson to us as well.

Malcolm wrote:

I clarified, had you been reading carefully, that use of the the term "hag" was a result of Western patriarchal expectations, thus undermining the intent of the original Tibetan text.

BTW, if there is a word for "hag" in Tibetan it would be 'bag mo [འབག་མོ་, literary "mask woman"], as in Sa skya 'bag mo i.e. the witches of Sakya, three very powerful demonesses that are mundane protectors. The term 'bag mo is also used for evil women.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

dude said:

I think this will be harder for Tibetan Buddhists because supernaturalism is a governing principle in Tibetan Buddhism and is used as a criteria for its ultimate validity.

This in itself goes against the Buddha's teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I can tell, the rise in the phenomena of recorded magical battles between Buddhists and Hindus reflected the reality that Buddhists in India were in a losing war in which Hindus, for many complicated reasons, were eventually able to drive Institutional Buddhism to its knees.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think this will be harder for Tibetan Buddhists because supernaturalism is a governing principle in Tibetan Buddhism and is used as a criteria for its ultimate validity.

Demonstrations of siddhis were the rule in ancient contests between Buddhists and

Hindus, not the exception if we are to understand how Tibetans perceived the viability of the siddha tradition in ancient India.

Nighthawk said:

Is the "rainbow body" also a supernatural element of TB that Tibetan Buddhists need to get rid of?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that Tibetan Buddhists needed to get rid of anything. I am pointing out that many Tibetan Buddhist beliefs need to be understood as nonfalsifiable. I have actually been saying the same thing for over 15 years now. Inferentially, because many potential "converts" are attracted to Buddhism because of its supposed rationalism, forms like Vipassana are more likely to fit it with the dominant worldview in the West and therefore gain much wider currency. Just look at how the term "mindfulness" has been expropriated from Buddhism. Of course there will always be folks who are attracted to Tibetan Buddhism precisely because of its supernatural elements. But those beliefs are not likely to sustain the transmission of Dharma in the Industrialized West. We do not, for example, see magical duels between Buddhist siddhas and Catholic priests.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Is this insurmountable? No, of course not. However, traditional Tibetan Buddhists will need to accommodate science into their world view.

Anders said:

I don't think Buddhism needs to dump it's myths. It just needs to hold them with a light touch so that modern practitioners may adequately compartmentalise this and science. Given the hoops scientific Christians manage to jump through to accomplish such a feat, I think that's fairly manageable for your average modern Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

I think this will be harder for Tibetan Buddhists because supernaturalism is a governing principle in Tibetan Buddhism and is used as a criteria for its ultimate validity. Demonstrations of siddhis were the rule in ancient contests between Buddhists and Hindus, not the exception if we are to understand how Tibetans perceived the viability of the siddha tradition in ancient India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Sexism in Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Here are a few images of female Buddhas/10th Bhumi Bodhisattvas in Tibetan Buddhism. Some are found also in other forms of Buddhism:

Malcolm wrote:

Please note however that all these images correspond to patriarchal (Brahmanical in this case) social expectations around female beauty.

kirtu said:

The Tara's are of course. However I have a tale for you: one day Naropa was sitting outside the gate at his monastic university reading a parjnaparamita text. An aged hag come up and asked, do you understand what you are reading? Naropa answered, yes, I understand the words. The hag danced for joy. Then Naropa said "I also understand the meaning." Whereupon the hag wept bitterly.....

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Use of the word "hag" indicates again patriarchal expectations around female beauty, availability and desirability, in this case, Western ones since the word "hag" does not exist in Tibetan.

hag 1 |hag|

noun

1 a witch, esp. one in the form of an ugly old woman (often used as a term of disparagement for a woman): a fat old hag in a dirty apron.

In the original text by Tsang Nyon Heruka, she is simply described as an old women (rgan mo) with thirty seven signs of ugliness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Sexism in Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Here are a few images of female Buddhas/10th Bhumi Bodhisattvas in Tibetan Buddhism. Some are found also in other forms of Buddhism:

Malcolm wrote:

Please note however that all these images correspond to patriarchal (Brahmanical in this case) social expectations around female beauty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I don't think it is (neither is Islam or Christianity) I think that YOU are facing a crisis of modernity (and projecting it onto Buddhism).

Malcolm wrote:

What I observe is that fundamentalism is how the world's religions are dealing with such things as evolution, science, etc.

Sherab Dorje said:

Sure, I agree. But you know what? Fundamentalism (unfortunately, as far as I am concerned) works really well at overcoming crises. REALLY well.

Malcolm wrote:

Reacting to a crisis is not the same thing as overcoming a crisis. Thus, I must disagree with your assessment.

Buddhism as a whole has a somewhat better chance of dealing with the crisis of modernity because it was reconstructed as a "science" in the late 19th century, with Theravada largely jumping on this bandwagon early on.

Tibetan Buddhism on the other hand is, at present, the least well equipped to deal with modernity because it has layers and layers of metaphysical developments due to it being the end product of 1300 years of the development and evolution of Buddhist thought in India (and of course, this includes the period between 650-1500 in Tibet itself and its unique permutations of basically Indic materials).

Is this insurmountable? No, of course not. However, traditional Tibetan Buddhists will need to accommodate science into their world view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I don't think it is (neither is Islam or Christianity) I think that YOU are facing a crisis of modernity (and projecting it onto Buddhism).

Malcolm wrote:

What I observe is that fundamentalism is how the world's religions are dealing with such things as evolution, science, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

Since I don't agree that when using "I" and "mine" I am accepting the idea of a conventional self I find it difficult to discuss this further. I just don't think the Buddha ever made a distinction between a conventional self that is existing and an unconventional non changing ultimate self that don't exist.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact he did:

"Ananda, if I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is a self — were to answer that there is a self, that would be conforming with those brahmans & contemplatives who are exponents of eternalism [the view that there is an eternal, unchanging soul]. If I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is no self — were to answer that there is no self, that would be conforming with those brahmans & contemplatives who are exponents of annihilationism [the view that death is the annihilation of consciousness]. If I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is a self — were to answer that there is a self, would that be in keeping with the arising of knowledge that all phenomena are not-self?"

"No, lord."

"And if I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is no self — were to answer that there is no self, the bewildered Vacchagotta would become even more bewildered: 'Does the self I used to have now not exist?'"

And this is a nice one:

"It's just as when a dog is tied by a leash to a post or stake: If it walks, it walks right around that post or stake. If it stands, it stands right next to that post or stake. If it sits, it sits right next to that post or stake. If it lies down, it lies down right next to that post or stake.

"In the same way, an uninstructed run-of-the-mill person regards form as: 'This is mine, this is my self, this is what I am.' He regards feeling... perception... fabrications... consciousness as: 'This is mine, this is my self, this is what I am.' If he walks, he walks right around these five clinging-aggregates. If he stands, he stands right next to these five clinging-aggregates. If he sits, he sits right next to these five clinging-aggregates. If he lies down, he lies down right next to these five clinging-aggregates. Thus one should reflect on one's mind with every moment: 'For a long time has this mind been defiled by passion, aversion, & delusion.' From the defilement of the mind are beings defiled. From

the purification of the mind are beings purified.

Gaddula Sutta: The Leash (2)

Here you can clearly see how the Buddha teaches the conventional self. You have to remember, the corollary of "conventional" is "prior to analysis".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 22nd, 2013 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Science does not reject metaphysical claims, it simply is not equipped to deal with them.

Practice said:

I think this is a half truth. It is true that science is not equipped to deal with them, and false that it does not reject metaphysical claims. I think the inherent paradigm of science has to reject it.

Malcolm wrote:

Now that you have given your position, in my opinion, I can see that you are in reaction against modernity.

You are confusing science with logical positivism, in my opinion. Science is unconcerned with metaphysics.

Practice said:

We are rapidly losing any personal contact with any inner understanding and orientation. I think this is where Buddhism shines. It addresses the inner questions of "how we be", a "quality of being".

Malcolm wrote:

Only in so far as, at its best, Buddhism deconstructs the whole ontological project and shows that it is fundamentally pointless since categories of being are proven to be mere conventions, at best.

One does not even need to commit to the bare minimum of Buddhist metaphysical tenets (rebirth, karma and so on) in order to benefit greatly from the Buddhist meditation, ethics, and so on. Of course, anyone who argues that these basic metaphysics are not essential to Buddhadharma itself is deeply mistaken.

Practice said:

All our behavior and actions are up for self review. Out of this inner inquiry and self cultivation, self understanding can grow. This is simply not the concerns of western science.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not true. Neuroscience, for example, is very concerned how social behavior, language, cognition, emotion and so on are grounded in our embodiment as human beings and what that implies for our contentment and happiness. I think you will find that many people involved in the sciences see science as a means of inner inquiry and self-understanding.

Practice said:

I personally hope Buddhism does not drift over to the paradigm of science and lose what it uniquely has to contribute to our self understanding. If it does may be we should call it Neo-Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Plainly put: Buddhists will have to cope with science. They will do so in a variety of fashions. Some will retreat into fundamentalism, rejecting science (while nevertheless enjoying its fruits, such as the internet and so on); some will manage a happy coexistence, and some will want to revise Buddhism to make it "scientific".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Hanmi Buddhism

Content:

Snovid said:

Buddhist these guys are not.

In fact

I also do not consider myself to be a Buddhist

I adore Dzogchen and Bon because of shamanism

Malcolm wrote:

Shamanism and Dzogchen have nothing to do with each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

I do understand what conventional means. But I don't agree that using the "label "I" and "me", you are accepting the "existence" of a conventional self". The Buddha's teaching on the 5 skandhas is clearly pointing to the non-existence of a conventional self. I agree that label "I" and "me", you might be accepting the "existence" of a conventional person. A person is simply not a self. A self is an abstract construct based on a giant misunderstanding and person on the other hand is something quite different.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

If you do not accept a conventional "self" you are in fact rejecting the designations "I" and "mine". I don't really have any stake in convincing you otherwise, but you will find if you pursue this line of reasoning you will be locked into some funny contradictions.

Incidentally, person [pudgala] and self [atman] are generally considered to be synonyms in Buddhist literature. I have never, in all my years of studying these texts ever seen any Indian or Tibetan author make a case that persons and selves ought to be treated as distinct and different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You mean people do not use the convention "I" and "me" to refer to themselves?

heart said:

Sure they do, still no proof of an actual conventional self.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Conventional means "dependent on designation", not actual, truly existent, etc.

If you use the label "I" and "me", you are accepting the "existence" of a conventional self but not necessarily a real, true, actual self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 11:46 AM

Title: Re: Awakening the Sacred Body

Content:

Snowid said:

So if I'm working with the lowest chakra as described by TWR
this means that I'm working on the base chakra in the description of the Hindu?

Crown chakra in Bon

is equivalent of hindu crown chakra and the third eye ?

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 11:43 AM

Title: Re: Dra Thalgyur Tantra

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the abidharmakosa translation is from the french. it shouldnt be hard or take too long to translate the tantra from french to english.

Malcolm wrote:

Much if the tantra makes very little sense on its own without the commentary.

The commentary is roughly 1400 folios long.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 11:38 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, there is a self, there is birth, there is death, and rebirth. Conventionally, there is also karma. Ultimately there is no self, no birth, no death, no rebirth, and also no karma.

heart said:

I am not sure I agree with that. Even conventionally there is no self. If there was someone would be able to find it, but no such luck.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You mean people do not use the convention "I" and "me" to refer to themselves?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

How does that affect me here and now?

Malcolm wrote:

If you really followed that line of thinking yourself, you would never post.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Awakening the Sacred Body

Content:

Snowid said:

Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche described in his book exercises with five chakras

Why does not have all the seven?

Where can I find a description of exercise with the other two chakras?

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, five cakras is the Buddhist/Bon system. Seven is the Hindu system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Scientific methodology cannot verify non-falsifiable phenomena (such as karma, rebirth, God, etc.) because they cannot be tested and reproduced. Nonfalsifiability does not render something false, merely untestable at present.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Yes, that is quite correct.

But a big factor is also what the terms mean.

For example, if karma is used to express some sense of cause and effect, then that can be tested.

Malcolm wrote:

But that is not strictly what karma means. Karma refers to morally driven actions performed by a person whose continuum, either in this life or in some future life, will experience the ripening [phala] of that action.

Cause and condition [hetu and pratyaya] is a separate topic; necessary for understanding karma, but more general.

For this reason, Vasubandhu first writes about causes and conditions; then he writes about dependent origination; then he writes about karma: moving from the very general to the very specific.

PadmaVonSamba said:

if it refers only to some notion of

some continuity of behavior patterns or conditions from one lifetime to another then, not so easy to test.

Malcolm wrote:

That is what karma means.

PadmaVonSamba said:

And, it depends on what you define as a 'lifetime'.
if there is no 'self', how long is a lifetime?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, there is a self, there is birth, there is death, and rebirth. Conventionally, there is also karma. Ultimately there is no self, no birth, no death, no rebirth, and also no karma.

The lifespan of human beings is considered to be about 80 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Dra Thalgyur Tantra

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Thanks Malcolm..thats what I was afraid of..and let me guess..there is no English translation/commentary, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Not yet...Jean Luc Achard has apparently rendered the whole in French however. I am slowly working on it, and have let the SSI translators know this. So who knows, perhaps my draft will someday become the basis for a publication. But I have completed less than 10 percent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Ivo said:

A careful reading of the Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sutra will also appeal to some Star Wars fans, and it seems to be one of the early texts, although not of Tibetan origin.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, the concept that this or that form of Buddhadharma is being practiced in some other world system than our own is not an innovation of Dzogchen texts, but appears in Mahāyāna texts from an early time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Science does not reject metaphysical claims, it simply is not equipped to deal with them.

Scientific methodology cannot verify non-falsifiable phenomena (such as karma, rebirth, God, etc.) because they cannot be tested and reproduced. Nonfalsifiability does not render something false, merely untestable at present.

smcj said:

Along the same lines, studies of complex systems, like macro economics, cannot be tested and reproduced either, which is why there are so many different economic theories.

Malcolm wrote:

Economics is often called "the dismal science", when in fact it is actually dismal science.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 21st, 2013 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Dra Thalgyur Tantra

Content:

Fa Dao said:

This Tantra seems to be one that is referenced a great deal by many different Dzogchen Teachers. So of course I am thinking it is of obvious importance. I have a few questions#1 Can anyone who can actually read Tibetan give a brief synopsis of the main thrust of this Tantra in comparison to say other Dzogchen Tantras? and #2 how difficult is this Tantra to read if one were to try and learn Tibetan? I just remember somewhere where ChNN had said how difficult some passages were in the Marvelous Primordial State to render into English. It seems that some things in Tibetan are more direct and pithy and others...well..not so much. Any help/insight would be greatly appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

This tantra is a sprawling text that cannot be correctly read without the aid of a commentary.

It presents the entire path of Dzogchen, embryology, cosmology, etc.

Even if one were to learn Tibetan, a classical education in the five classical sciences is a requirement to actually understand any of these texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:
ddorje said:
Isn't this quite deconstructionist?

Malcolm wrote:
Tibetan Buddhists could take some lessons from Derrida, etc. It might stave off a lot of naive beliefs about our textual traditions.

In any event, there is a long standing critical tradition with Tibetan Buddhism, the problem with it is that it is usually only applied to the other guy's books and not our own.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 11:38 PM
Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it
Content:
ddorje said:
Isn't this quite deconstructionist?

Malcolm wrote:
Tibetan Buddhists could take some lessons from Derrida, etc. It might stave off a lot of naive beliefs about our textual traditions.

In any event, there is a long standing critical tradition with Tibetan Buddhism, the problem with it is that it is usually only applied to the other guy's books and not our own.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 11:28 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?
Content:
Ivo said:
As this topic of discussion is quite serious and has a lot of implications it will be meaningful only if some "universally" accepted teacher comes forward with some clear statements.

dzogchungpa said:
What kind of implications are you referring to?

Ivo said:
Well... think for yourself what it would mean if a certain Buddha field from which a certain doctrine is said to have originated can be correlated to a physically observable place in our universe. The implications are more than what most Dharma practitioners will be able to handle comfortably.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, the present day origin of Dzogchen teaching can be correlated to a physically

identifiable place in the Universe and we are located on it. Otherwise, since most Mahāyāna practitioners who are familiar with the accounts of the universe, for example, as presented in the opening chapters of the Avatamska sutras will have no problem with the idea of the existence of planets in other solar systems and civilizations which exist in them. Nor for that matter will Star Wars fans be that surprised:

In any case, the first chapter of the sgra thal gyur identifies 13 buddhafiels where Dzogchen is practiced. The introduction to the The Supreme Source discusses these in much detail.

It should be noted however that in terms of textual history, there is no mention anywhere of this concept in Tibetan literature which can be reliably dated earlier than the sgra thal rgyur itself, which most likely was compiled between the 10th and 11th centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Practice said:

It would be helpful for understanding your over all thesis. I truly would like to understand.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

"Science" is an open-ended iterative method of inquiry into physical reality. Scientism is a belief system, which includes metaphysical beliefs, constructed out of the findings of the former.

Practice said:

To make sure that I am not misunderstanding you-

Two questions:

Does "true science" (science void of scientism) then reject any metaphysical claims? Also, a major branch of metaphysics is ontology, would science embrace ontological inquires or consider them a form of scientism also?

Malcolm wrote:

Science does not reject metaphysical claims, it simply is not equipped to deal with them.

Scientific methodology cannot verify non-falsifiable phenomena (such as karma, rebirth, God, etc.) because they cannot be tested and reproduced. Nonfalsifiability does not

render something false, merely untestable at present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Can someone give an example which demonstrates how:

"Scientism is a belief system, which includes metaphysical beliefs, constructed out of the findings of the former."

Malcolm wrote:

For example, deciding that neuro-cognitive functions prove that mind is at best a epiphenomena of the brain. That is a species of metaphysical belief.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 20th, 2013 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Practice said:

It would be helpful for understanding your over all thesis. I truly would like to understand.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

"Science" is an open-ended iterative method of inquiry into physical reality. Scientism is a belief system, which includes metaphysical beliefs, constructed out of the findings of the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 19th, 2013 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Science (as opposed to Scientism) is always "...there is still a lot yet that we don't know".

Practice said:

Could you please be clearer on your distinction between "Science" and "Scientism"?

Please be specific, I think this is very important for communication and an

understanding of your position.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientism>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 19th, 2013 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

luckily, Dzogchen is not a religion! rigpa is not an illusion..

Malcolm wrote:

Vidyā is knowing illusions as illusions. But vidyā itself is not something "real".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 18th, 2013 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

Then it turns out the universe is a hologram of a reality that is two dimensional

<http://www.nature.com/news/simulations-back-up-theory-that-universe-is-a-hologram-1.14328>

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, maybe not.

heart said:

This is where DJKR goes wrong it is only religion that knows because science is always "maybe, maybe not".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Religions give an illusion of certainty. And of course they contradict each other on every detail.

Science (as opposed to Scientism) is always "...there is still a lot yet that we don't know".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 18th, 2013 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

How is this different than Advaita Vedanta?

Tsongkhapafan said:

Because the self is not asserted as permanent.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean Buddhahood is conditioned? Whatever is impermanent is conditioned.

Tsongkhapafan said:

A Buddha's self is imputed on the Truth Body

Malcolm wrote:

A Buddha imputes a conditioned self onto the permanent dharmakāya? That seems very strange to me.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Buddhas can impute non-conceptually.

Malcolm wrote:

This is incoherent. Imputations cannot exist in absence of conceptuality, for example, in a direct perception.

Tsongkhapafan said:

It is a valid basis for imputing an I just as the parts of a car are a valid basis for imputing 'car' even though no car can be found in any of the parts of the car. The car, as a conceptual imputation, functions. So it is with the I or self - it functions in dependence upon being imputed upon the body and mind, otherwise it would be non-existent.

Malcolm wrote:

The parts of a car are not a valid basis for imputing a "car". If they were a valid basis for imputing a car, a car would work when all its parts were piled in a disorganized heap. So your assertion fails.

Tsongkhapafan said:

This verse is often misinterpreted.

Malcolm wrote:

Your alternate translation is incorrect. Mine is based directly on Candrakirti's own commentary.

Tsongkhapafan said:
It is absurd to suggest that Buddhas do not have minds.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhas do not possess vijñāna; they possess only jñāna. This is a point poorly understood by most.

In any case, you admit that Candrakirti's verse states that all objects of knowledge are burnt by the fire of wisdom. Even you must admit a mind cannot arise in absence of an object. If there are no objects for a Buddha (as indicated by the verse above), how can a mind (citta) arise, conceptual or otherwise? Therefore, to call the wisdom of a Buddha a "mind" is at best a convention. A Buddha's mind is an omniscient nonconceptual wisdom.

Nāgarjuna states for example in the Sixty Verses of Reasonings:

When reflection-like things
are seen fully with the eye of wisdom,
those great beings
will not be stuck in the swamp of objects.

When there is no attachment, since there is no attachment to or engagement to those things as a self, there is no attachment to the swamp of objects. āryas are conventionally "like [those ones who have] trained their minds on reflections".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 10:36 PM
Title: Re: Common Anatta Question
Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
Buddhas impute 'I' upon the Truth Body, which is their valid basis of imputation and is therefore not wrong.

Malcolm wrote:
How is this different than Advaita Vedanta?

Further, how can Buddhas impute anything? The dharmakāya is the "mind" of a Buddha, and is completely free of all concepts. How can there be imputation when there is no conceptuality?

Further, how are the body and mind "valid" bases for imputing an I? No self can be found in either.

I am afraid you have long since abandoned any form of Madhyamaka, let alone "Prasanga".

Since all of the dried fire wood of knowledge objects
have been burned, that peace is the dharmakāya of the victors;
at that time there is no arising, no cessation;
that cessation of the mind is the direct perception of the kāya.

Candrakirti comments upon this that cessation of mind and mental factors is
conventionally termed "direct perception" of the kāya.

jeeprs said:

I am struggling to understand how this is not nihilism. If it is the complete cessation of
all concepts and the end of 'the person' how is this state different from non-existence?

Malcolm wrote:

"Persons" never started, so how could they end?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Practice said:

@ Malcolm

Your original post is well put and is a thesis that needs to be reckoned with, by all
religions.

Let me ask you though, in your view what is the value, if any, to being a Buddhist? Why
bother if science has a more modern and better approach to the structure of reality?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see Buddhadharma and scientific inquiry as being inherently in conflict.

Buddhism and Scientism on the other hand, are bound to be in conflict.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Buddhas impute 'I' upon the Truth Body, which is their valid basis of imputation and is
therefore not wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

How is this different than Advaita Vedanta?

Further, how can Buddhas impute anything? The dharmakāya is the "mind" of a Buddha,
and is completely free of all concepts. How can there be imputation when there is no

conceptuality?

Further, how are the body and mind "valid" bases for imputing an I? No self can be found in either.

I am afraid you have long since abandoned any form of Madhyamaka, let alone "Prasanga".

Since all of the dried fire wood of knowledge objects have been burned, that peace is the dharmakāya of the victors; at that time there is no arising, no cessation; that cessation of the mind is the direct perception of the kāya.

Candrakirti comments upon this that cessation of mind and mental factors is conventionally termed "direct perception" of the kāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Khechara

Content:

Konchog1 said:

I know it is a Tantric Pure Land (whatever that means) and that Tantric practice is the cause to be reborn there (especially the practice of Vajrayogini).

Besides from that, what are the properties of Khechara? What is life there like? How does Khechara differ from Sukhavati?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

For one there are women there...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Care to name the (English) source?

Malcolm wrote:

The English source ultimately is myself. I translated the Doha, revised it with Lama Migmar. He allowed Sakya Center to print it, but left my name out inadvertently.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 17th, 2013 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Catherine of Siena said:

The Absolute Innocence of all within my Creation takes a while to understand.

dzogchungpa said:

Did he say how long?

Malcolm wrote:

I have seen Catherine's head in Sienna, where it is preserved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Whether he actually said the things he is purported to have said or not, there are teachings you can actually practice and get the same results,

Malcolm wrote:

Have you met someone who has returned from Sukhavati and reported on it to you?

pueraeternus said:

What are your views on practices such as Phowa?

(Not a loaded question, just curious based on your take on buddhaksetras).

Malcolm wrote:

I dont have much of a view about them. I have done a few phowa retreats, got signs and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

Then it turns out the universe is a hologram of a reality that is two dimensional

<http://www.nature.com/news/simulations-back-up-theory-that-universe-is-a-hologram-1.14328>

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Maybe, maybe not.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 11:40 PM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
dude said:
Heaven in monotheism is eternal.
In Buddhism, it isn't even outside the realm of birth and death!

Malcolm wrote:
Of course, I know this. But this is a mere sectarian definition. And this does not make the Buddhist definition true and the eternalist definition false.

In short, all of these beliefs are just mediated by some book someone chooses to believe as opposed to some other books they choose not to believe.

When I say that I "don't beleive" in Sukhavati, what I mean is that I am agnostic about it. I will admit though that there is certain a poetic quality to the mandalas through which the Sukhavati and so on are described. However, remove the Buddhist context and these paradises very are very similar.

And of course there are some unappealingly sexist aspects to the Sukhavati teachings as well as such as:

"[A]fter any woman hears my name, rouses full faith and generates the mind to awaken, she will condemn the female body, and after exchanging those at that time, should she take a female body twice, I shall not attain anuttarasamyaksambodhi."

Of course, we can understand such attitudes to be symptomatic of the age. But if we take that approach, what else should we not just regard as cultural relics?

The doctrine of buddhakṣetras is of course deeply embedded in Mahāyāna Buddhist teachings from a very early period and pervades every Mahāyāna teaching including Dzogchen.

I personally think the motivation for developing such teachings comes as an early response to the doctrine that full buddhahood requires three incalculable eons to attain, i.e. imagining a place in which an ordinary person can find bliss and ease to practice dharma without having to be an 8th stage bodhisattva (required for rebirth in Akaniṣṭha Gaṇḍavyuha)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Whether he actually said the things he is purported to have said or not, there are teachings you can actually practice and get the same results,

Malcolm wrote:

Have you met someone who has returned from Sukhavati and reported on it to you?

While there are certainly some results we can confirm in this triple realm, rebirth in realms outside the three realms is not something we can ascertain personally. So we either take them on faith, actively disbelieve, or remain agnostic regarding them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Upon what is this mere person imputed in absence of aggregates? If there is no basis of imputation, what is the difference between this mere person and horns on a rabbit?

Tsongkhapa said:

The mere person is imputed on their mind and body which is mere appearance, one nature with emptiness. That explains why there are no aggregates in nirvana, there is just the appearance of them and the appearance of a person imputed on them. Emptiness is appearing as these phenomena, although that's not someone's constant experience until they attain enlightenment - there is an appearance of inherently existent aggregates until the imprints of the delusions are removed and omniscience is achieved.

Malcolm wrote:

If there are no aggregates in nirvana, how can there be an appearance of aggregates? It seems you are suggesting that in fact that the appearance of aggregates in nirvana are like the appearance of horns on a rabbit. In other words, these aggregates, which you now agree do not exist in nirvana, appear there due to a false imputation. Is this correct? But if this is so, you also agree that Buddhas make this false imputation, and as Candrakirti observes, they would not then transcend samsara because whoever makes false imputations cannot be considered a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, Sukhavati is just a heaven -- no different than the heaven of Christians, Muslims, or Hindus.

PadmaVonSamba said:

In what way, exactly, is it "no different"?

- .
- .
- .

Malcolm wrote:

They are places where the faithful imagine they will go when they die.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 16th, 2013 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

dude said:

Do you believe in nirvana?

Malcolm wrote:

That rather depends on who is defining it, why and how.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Is there a person in Nirvana? What kind of person?

Malcolm wrote:

A mere person, otherwise nirvana is the extinction of existence and the extreme of nothingness.[/quote]

Upon what is this mere person imputed in absence of aggregates? If there is no basis of imputation, what is the difference between this mere person and horns on a rabbit?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 9:59 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, Sukhavati is just a heaven -- no different than the heaven of Christians, Muslims, or Hindus.

Nighthawk said:

How is that so? Can you practice the Dharma and manifest Buddhahood in those heavens?

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmmm.....I think the point is that I don't really believe in heavens, Buddhist or otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Alfredo said:

Perhaps I am not really sold on the Buddhist teaching that samsaric activities are a waste of time...

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahāyāna skills in the sciences of all kinds are encouraged because they benefit beings. So I think a lot of Buddhists were not sold on this (early Buddhist) idea as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, you are at the end of your argument. You can object to the aesthetics of meat eating, but you really do not have a moral basis to protest against it. At least animals slaughtered in a butcher house are not automatically left to rot where they are killed.

In the end, everything we eat comes from the abattoir of industrial food production. That is just how things are right now. Does it have to stay that way? No. Is it likely to stay that way? Yes.

M

gad rgyangs said:

your argument is the Johnny-not-so-Dangerously school of thought: "since one can't do everything, there's no point in doing anything", closely akin to the "kill 'em all and let Buddha sort 'em out" argument.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is recognizing that you cannot fix samsara.

But I understand that city dwellers who do not actually participate in the act of food production other than as consumers have a very abstract view of the situation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no aggregates in nirvana. How can it be a state of mind?

Tsongkhapafan said:

If there are no aggregates, there is no person...

Malcolm wrote:

Is there a person in Nirvana? What kind of person?

Aryadeva clearly states in 400 Verses:

[Since] there are no aggregates in nirvana,
a person cannot possibly be [in nirvana].

Candrakirti comments on this:

If there are aggregates in nirvana, there is also a person. At that time, because they exist [i.e. aggregates and persons], in contradiction with sūtra there will be a support that turns into nirvana, and samsara cannot be transcended.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

this is actually a nice contribution to the debate: not only does eating meat contribute to the suffering and killing of animals, but it contributes to the accumulation of bad

karma by other sentient beings by creating jobs in slaughterhouses, butchers etc.

Malcolm wrote:

So does eating plants by creating jobs for exterminators, hunters (used for pest control) and so on, who kill billions of insects and animals every year in order to make sure you get your tofu.

gad rgyangs said:

meat eaters not only create those jobs too, but the slaughterhouse and butcher jobs as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, you are at the end of your argument. You can object to the aesthetics of meat eating, but you really do not have a moral basis to protest against it. At least animals slaughtered in a butcher house are not automatically left to rot where they are killed.

In the end, everything we eat comes from the abattoir of industrial food production. That is just how things are right now. Does it have to stay that way? No. Is it likely to stay that way? Yes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Of course eating meat is bad, because it always involves killing... which is bad.

porpoise said:

Yes, and for most people eating meat is dependent on others doing the killing and working in slaughterhouses, which must be a soul-destroying job - which is also considered to be Wrong Livelihood.

gad rgyangs said:

this is actually a nice contribution to the debate: not only does eating meat contribute to the suffering and killing of animals, but it contributes to the accumulation of bad karma by other sentient beings by creating jobs in slaughterhouses, butchers etc.

Malcolm wrote:

So does eating plants by creating jobs for exterminators, hunters (used for pest control) and so on, who kill billions of insects and animals every year in order to make sure you get your tofu.

gad rgyangs said:

New research has found that the use of common pesticides in Europe and Australia has

killed up to 42 percent of invertebrates, which make up about 95 percent of all animal species.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.earthweek.com/2013/ew130621/ew130621b.html>

Pest control in organic agriculture:

Here we use one kind of sentient being to kill another kind of sentient beings:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/agriculture/crops/insects/fad64s00.html#Direct%20Treatment>

gad rgyangs said:

Pesticides are found as common contaminants in soil, air, water and on non-target organisms in our urban landscapes. Once there, they can harm plants and animals ranging from beneficial soil microorganisms and insects, non-target plants, fish, birds, and other wildlife. Chlorpyrifos, a common contaminant of urban streams (U.S. Geological Survey, 1999), is highly toxic to fish, and has caused fish kills in waterways near treated fields or buildings (US EPA, 2000). Herbicides can also be toxic to fish. According to the EPA, studies show that trifluralin, an active ingredient in the weed-killer Snapshot, “is highly to very highly toxic to both cold and warm water fish” (U.S. EPA, 1996). In a series of different tests it was also shown to cause vertebral deformities in fish (Koyama, 1996). The weed-killers Ronstar and Roundup are also acutely toxic to fish (Folmar et al., 1979; Shafiei and Costa, 1990). The toxicity of Roundup is likely due to the high toxicity of one of the inert ingredients of the product (Folmar et al., 1979). In addition to direct acute toxicity, some herbicides may produce sublethal effects on fish that lessen their chances for survival and threaten the population as a whole. Glyphosate or glyphosate-containing products can cause sublethal effects such as erratic swimming and labored breathing, which increase the fish's chance of being eaten (Liong et al., 1988). 2,4-D herbicides caused physiological stress responses in sockeye salmon (McBride et al., 1981) and reduced the food-gathering abilities of rainbow trout (Little, 1990).

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2984095/>

In short, there is no kind of mass food production which does not involve the wholesale annihilation of billions of creatures, both invertebrate and vertebrate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

but strictly speaking nirvana is the peace of mind that is experienced when all delusions have been removed. Only living beings can experience nirvana, inanimate objects

cannot, because it is a state of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no aggregates in nirvana. How can it be a state of mind?

dude said:

Good question, but it can't be oblivion either, or it wouldn't be peaceful abiding, eh?

Malcolm wrote:

Who stated nirvana was peaceful abiding? Nirvana is peace, meaning a state free from arising or ceasing.

The Mahāyāna analysis holds that as all phenomena never arose from the start, all phenomena have been in a state of nirvana from the start.

Nirvana cannot be oblivion, because "oblivion" means a state of annihilation [where it does not mean a state of unconsciousness].

Nirvana is cessation. Cessation is not annihilation, cessation is the absence of causes for further arising.

For this reason, in Mahāyana, reality is described as non-arisen and unceasing. What has not arisen cannot cease, hence nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

duckfiasco said:

Malcolm, what do you make then of the proliferation of Zen books that don't mention the Four Seals, sila, Refuge, or indeed anything other than "being in the present" and already being enlightened so there's nothing to do?

I wonder what enlightenment even means with such little context.

I add too that these books are often written for beginners or a lay audience for whom this may be the primary exposure to Buddhism.

If these are not indicative of Western or American Zen, then I'll be very relieved to be corrected.

Malcolm wrote:

You would have to give me some examples.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

but strictly speaking nirvana is the peace of mind that is experienced when all delusions have been removed. Only living beings can experience nirvana, inanimate objects cannot, because it is a state of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no aggregates in nirvana. How can it be a state of mind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 15th, 2013 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

not only are all arguments about the nature of reality flawed, but so are all descriptions. what the lady said.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a description, it is intended as a proof that there can be a Real that is beyond all predicates.

Simply put, if one can think of a real beyond all predicates, there is a real beyond all predicates.

gad rgyangs said:

its not taken seriously anymore. and it certainly ain't no rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Its taken very seriously among philosophers, and like all arguments, is interesting if only as a literary phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

not only are all arguments about the nature of reality flawed, but so are all descriptions. what the lady said.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a description, it is intended as a proof that there can be a Real that is beyond all

predicates.

Simply put, if one can think of a real beyond all predicates, there is a real beyond all predicates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

Astus said:

Buddhism is about meditation. It is not a religion, it only looks like one, but that is a mistake. That's why Buddhists in the West are called 'practitioners' because unless you meditate it is not even Buddhism.

ReasonAndRhyme said:

Hi Astus,

I'm not sure which part of your post is a quote and which part is you speaking, but concerning the above statement: this is not necessarily so. In Tibetan Buddhism it is a widespread view that you're a Buddhist when you accept the Four Seals. This is for instance how Dzongzhar Jamyang Khyentse defines being a Buddhist in

<http://www.shambhala.com/what-makes-you-not-a-buddhist.html>:

Anyone who accepts these four seals, even independently of Buddha's teachings, even never having heard the name Shakyamuni Buddha, can be considered to be on the same path as he

What sets Buddhism apart from the religions of the world? I believe it boils down to the four seals (...)

(I'm afraid I can't give any page numbers cause I'm reading the eBook.)

This is also how it was defined in a Gelug study course I participated in a while ago.

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Pandita is more precise. To be considered a follower of Buddhadharma you must:

1. Accept the four seals*
2. Have gone for Refuge
3. Either be training in Buddhadharma through śīla, samadhi and prajñā or have realized the fruit of the three trainings.

According to his thinking, if one satisfies all three criteria listed above, only then can one be considered a follower of Buddhadharma. Personally, I agree with him.

M

*He makes an exception for pudgalavadins because while they do not accept the four seals, they nevertheless go for refuge and engage in the three trainings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

from Jetsunma Tenzin Palmo's FB page:

One time I saw this Russian Orthodox priest who was being interviewed, and he said the first thing they learn in the novitiate is that anything they say or think about God – it's not that. And we could say that exactly for the nature of our true existence. Whatever we think we are, we're not that. It's all just words, but the experience is beyond words.

Malcolm wrote:

The old ontological argument of St. Anselm:

Our understanding of God is a being than which no greater can be conceived.

The idea of God exists in the mind.

A being which exists both in the mind and in reality is greater than a being that exists only in the mind.

If God only exists in the mind, then we can conceive of a greater being—that which exists in reality.

We cannot be imagining something that is greater than God.

Therefore, God exists.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ontological_argument#Anselm

Recast:

Our understanding of the Real is a being than which no greater can be conceived.

The idea of the Real exists in the mind.

A being which exists both in the mind and in reality is greater than a being that exists only in the mind.

If the Real only exists in the mind, then we can conceive of a greater being—that which exists in reality.

We cannot be imagining something that is greater than the Real.

Therefore, the Real exists.

A flawed argument, from my POV, but there you go.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All Mahayana asserts that all phenomena have been in the state of nirvana from the start.

Sherab said:

I remembered something about Garab Dorje (I think) debating with scholars...

Malcolm wrote:

Manjushrimitra, in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

when delusions are removed, what remains is unobstructed awareness (nirvana).

Nirvana not something extra that is obtained, that one didn't have before.

It is what occurs when the defilements are permanently removed.

Malcolm wrote:

"Here there is nothing to remove,

there is nothing to add.

Look correctly at the real

if the real is seen, liberation."

Abhisamayālaṃkāra-nāma-prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstrakārikā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

All phenomena are not in the state of nirvana from the beginning.

Malcolm wrote:

From a sūtra you hold to be definitive:

Subhuti, further, the Tathāgata has shown that sensations, perceptions, formations and consciousness (which do not inherently exist)— non-arisen, unceasing, peaceful from the beginning — to be in parinirvana inherently; all of that which has been demonstrated is not the indirect meaning, is not the intentional meaning, but should be understood literally.

-- Ārya-pañcaśatikā-prajñāpāramitā

I can provide many other similar citations from the prajñāpāramitā sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

What then, is the defining characteristic, from a buddhist understanding, or, since you mention other beings in other realms of samasara, of a human, of of beings in the human realm?

My understanding is that it is the suffering of change
a constant sense of dissatisfaction,
wanting things to change when they do not change,
wanting things to stay the same when they start to change.
But it is also this very thing that gives humans
the greatest opportunity for dharma understanding and practice.

.

Malcolm wrote:

All these features are lacking in Sukhavati: there is no dissatisfaction at all in Sukhavati, hence the name Sukhavativyuha, the field of bliss/happiness, etc.

Thus by your own analysis we cannot consider birth in Sukhavati a human birth place, not just because there is no womb birth in Sukhavati, according to its mythos, but because none of the feature you are defining as integral to human experience are present in that place. Hence the reason why birth in Sukhavati is a desiderata, according the Sukhavativyuha sūtras. One wishes to be born there precisely because all the obstacles we experience as human beings are lacking there. In reality, Sukhavati is just a heaven -- no different than the heaven of Christians, Muslims, or Hindus.

As I have mentioned elsewhere, there is good reason to suppose in fact that the blueprint for the concept of a Buddhist paradise arose in Central Asia (and not India) because of the Persian custom of building wall gardens, such as Cyrus the Great's walled garden at Pasargadae. The word "paradise" ultimately comes from the Avestan word "pairidaēza", which simple means walled garden where one can engage in peaceful pursuits.

And therefore, the reason I stated that human birth depends on being born from a human womb, which seemed obvious to me at the time, and still seems obvious. There are also no women in Sukhavati, and certainly our gendered experience is crucial to being human as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:
Astus said:
Zen is therefore a style.

Malcolm wrote:
Indeed, largely, though not entirely, based on Sung dynasty Neo-confucian aesthetics as interpreted by the Japanese.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:15 PM
Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?
Content:
Alfredo said:
but religions ought...not siphon off the resources...

Malcolm wrote:
But this is exactly what religions do. It is like asking a leopard to changes its spots to expect otherwise.

Anyway, Buddhist institutions are bipolar in terms of whether Buddhism is a religion or not. One minute Buddhist authors like Thinly Norbu Rinpoche is siding with theistic religions because Buddhism ought properly be grounded in "faith"; the next minute HHDL is telling us that Buddhism is scientific, and empirical verification is the standard Buddhism ought to be striving for.

In the end, it seems to me (and for many years, incidentally) that Buddhism is reeling from the knocks it is taking from its encounter with modernity.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:51 PM
Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
Is your point that as soon as one refers to Budd ism,
that the 'ism' makes it a reference to one specific tradition or another,
and that it is an inaccurate term because not all traditions agree on all the same doctrines,
hence, there is no common ("generic") Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:
I am making the point it is an inaccurate term for me for the reasons you state. That is why I prefer to call my "self" (a sensitive term around here, apparently) a follower of Buddhadharma, rather than a Buddhist of this or that type.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

My point is that what describes human birth in Sukhavati is not a meat & bones body, but the still-conditioned arising, the projection of mind, of the experience of being human, hearing, seeing, and so forth, the same way as it is experienced here and now, because the causes for that result to occur have not been severed

.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Devas and asuras are also held to be anthropomorphic, but we do not term them human births.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

The baby you were born as is dead

Malcolm wrote:

This is annihilationism. The opposite of the view you accused penum of holding.

PadmaVonSamba said:

No, Annihilationism requires some sort of 'self' that is annihilated. The total destruction of a soul.

.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not that restrictive. It also means the belief that some entity (like a seed) which existed before, does not exist now. See Nagarjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

you are still clinging to a notion of an intrinsic 'self', as I suggested before.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing me with Pensum.

PadmaVonSamba said:

I was responding to the statement "Where ever there are humans, there is womb birth."
Didn't you say that?

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but it does not bear the consequence you impute.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is one strand. There is also a strand of Mahayana that maintains that all perfections are perfected within prajnaparamita. This strand of Mahayana is more characteristic of the Lanka avatara sutra and other nongradual sutras.

smcj said:

Oh I understood that what you said was correct. I just thought that given your stature here you could have been a little more diligent and complete, that's all.

Malcolm wrote:

All Mahayana asserts that all phenomena have been in the state of nirvana from the start.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

smcj said:

From my perspective, the difference between Mahāyāna view and the view of the Nikayas is that Nikāyas view nirvana as a result to be obtained. Mahāyāna understands that all phenomena have always been in the state of nirvana from the start.

As you know the Mahayana-Paramitayana thinks of realization as something to be attained by accumulating merit and awareness. I know it's not your favorite view, and you did start your post with "From my perspective...", but still that's not a totally fair or complete take on the Mahayana.

Sorry to nit-pick.

Malcolm wrote:

That is one strand. There is also a strand of Mahayana that maintains that all perfections are perfected within prajnaparamita. This strand of Mahayana is more characteristic of the Lanka avatara sutra and other nongradual sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

smcj said:

From my perspective, the difference between Mahāyāna view and the view of the Nikayas is that Nikāyas view nirvana as a result to be obtained. Mahāyāna understands that all phenomena have always been in the state of nirvana from the start.

As you know the Mahayana-Paramitayana thinks of realization as something to be attained by accumulating merit and awareness. I know it's not your favorite view, and you did start your post with "From my perspective...", but still that's not a totally fair or complete take on the Mahayana.

Sorry to nit-pick.

Malcolm wrote:

That is one strand. There is also a strand of Mahayana that maintains that all perfections are perfected within prajnaparamita. This strand of Mahayana is more characteristic of the Lanka avatara sutra and other nongradual sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:40 AM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

duckfiasco said:

This is a major point where I think Western Zen has failed.

Malcolm wrote:

Do western Zen practitioners cultivate bodhicitta? Indeed, they do.

Do they need to believe in rebirth? No, they don't.

M

duckfiasco said:

I must've just had bad luck in the centers I went to and the books I read and the forums I visited being almost entirely devoid of talk of compassion, the paramitas, or other such things. DW has been a much appreciated exception.

Instead, it's all Buddha-nature and Dogen, and only a very small slice of his writings

about zazen, as Astus noted.

I'll avoid turning this into yet another thread on rebirth. We'll just have to disagree about the importance of rebirth.

I will say that I think it's symptomatic of a larger tendency to reject the parts of Buddhism and Zen that are unpalatable to Western culture or views.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say that rebirth was not important.

I just said they do not need to believe it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Are you your body?

.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha suggests in the Majjhima Nikaya that if, between the body and the mind, we were to choose one to regard as our self, he suggested it was better to choose the body since it least it lasted some 80 odd years, while the mind only lasts but an instant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

you are still clinging to a notion of an intrinsic 'self' , as I suggested before.

.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing me with Pensum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

[

The baby you were born as is dead.

.

Malcolm wrote:

This is annihilationism. The opposite of the view you accused pensum of holding.

Although the aggregates are serially connected,
the wise are to comprehend that nothing transfers

As I said on the other thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

dude said:

There is no self or person that undergoes rebirth in Mahāyāna. In this respect Mahāyāna view is no different than the view expressed in the Pali Canon.

Agreed, but the PC sutras do not go beyond phenomenology, while the final Mahayana teachings explain True Cause and the true aspect in full.

Malcolm wrote:

From my perspective, the difference between Mahāyāna view and the view of the Nikayas is that Nikāyas view nirvana as a result to be obtained. Mahāyāna understands that all phenomena have always been in the state of nirvana from the start.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

duckfiasco said:

This is a major point where I think Western Zen has failed.

Malcolm wrote:

Do western Zen practitioners cultivate bodhicitta? Indeed, they do.

Do they need to believe in rebirth? No, they don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: Common Anatta Question

Content:

smcj said:

Do you then accept the Pali Canon as the last word and reject the Mahayana sutras as heresy?

A lot of people do. That's 100% ok.

dude said:

People are free to believe what they will, but the reason I asked is that duckfiasco's reply is based on the Pali Canon sutras, while the Mahayana view is drastically different.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh?

There is no self or person that undergoes rebirth in Mahāyāna. In this respect Mahāyāna view is no different than the view expressed in the Pali Canon.

Although the aggregates are serially connected,
the wise are to comprehend that nothing transfers

Nāgārjuna

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Alfredo said:

the Maitreya Project (now thankfully cancelled) could have happened.

Malcolm wrote:

Not cancelled.

"The laying of the foundation stone for a very large Maitreya Buddha statue in Kushinagar, Uttar Pradesh, India, will take place during a ceremony on Friday, December 13, 2013..."

<http://mandala.fpmt.org/2013/maitreya-project-kushinagar-takes-important-step-forward/>

See also:

<http://www.maitreyaproject.org/en/index.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Chimed Sogthig Instructions

Content:

vangelis said:

Can you recommend me a teacher in these places,for this practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Shenphen Dawa Rinpoche in NYC, Khenpo Sonam in LA, etc., Vajrayana Foundation etc.

Just search Yeshe Nyingpo/ Dudjom Tersar,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: Chimed Sogthig Instructions

Content:

vangelis said:

Can anyone tell me where i can meet a Lama or Rinpoche who can give instructions about Dudjom Rinpoche`s Chimed Sogthig long sadhana ?

Malcolm wrote:

NYC, LA, San Fran, Oregon, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:08 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

...Is it because being human only happens in the human realm?

Malcolm wrote:

It is axiomatic that human birth can only happen to humans. Where ever there are humans, there is womb birth. That is not the case in our idealized paradises like Sukhavat (but unlike Abhirati) where there are no wombs at all, not even women in fact. I never met human being that did not derive in some way from a human womb (even test tube babies), have you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Western Myth of Zen

Content:

duckfiasco said:

The kind of meditation that results from this, in my opinion, becomes a way to sit in a seemingly equanimous fog as defilements play out unabated, remaining just as fierce off the cushion.

And since defilements are no issue and all we need is to "just sit" or "just eat" we can meditate for 5 minutes a day and feel real good is being done.

Malcolm wrote:

What the Chan/Zen schools have understood, like the Dzogchen and Mahāmudra traditions which followed them, is that buddhahood is not a result accomplished through effort, that afflictions are not something concrete that can be cleansed the same way we wash our clothes (in fact there is nothing to remove), and the cultivation of conditioned states of samadhi/dhyāna lead nowhere than to more conceptuality.

Since Western Zen practitioners are not harming you, why be so up in arms about it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

pensum said:

And yet they then turn around and claim that those who don't succeed in this life can take rebirth in a buddha realm where the circumstances are ideal and realization assured. I've never questioned it before, but i would be hard-pressed to see how such a rebirth could be considered "human". So even on that fundamental point there would seem to be some discrepancy and contradiction.

PadmaVonSamba said:

The problem is that you are still clinging to a notion of an intrinsic 'self' that takes rebirth.

.
. .
.

Malcolm wrote:

Pensum? No, I don't think so at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...it's a question of testability.

bob said:

Yes, and that implies having the right instruments for measurement. However, the limitations of the human vehicle preclude access to some of the higher levels of the spectrum...

Malcolm wrote:

Then such things are cognitively closed to us and not worthy of further speculation, don't you agree?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think this battle ended with all the lives of Ajasatru's soldiers being spared? They fought a battle. People surely died on both sides.

I can't speak for others, but there are plenty of Buddhist sutras where acts of killing are defended as virtuous, for example, the sea captain story and so on.

I am merely pointing out that the issue is not so simple as "killing is bad".

seeker242 said:

"Killing is never skillful. Stealing, lying, and everything else in the first list are never skillful. When asked if there was anything whose killing he approved of, the Buddha answered that there was only one thing: anger. In no recorded instance did he approve of killing any living being at all. When one of his monks went to an executioner and told the man to kill his victims compassionately, with one blow, rather than torturing them, the Buddha expelled the monk from the Sangha, on the grounds that even the recommendation to kill compassionately is still a recommendation to kill — something he would never condone. If a monk was physically attacked, the Buddha allowed him to strike back in self-defense, but never with the intention to kill."

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/lib/authors/thanissaro/gettingmessage.html>

Thanissaro Bhikkhu must just be wrong then? Although, I find that hard to believe. More like impossible to believe!

Malcolm wrote:

Context is everything. Soldiers are not monks. Laypeople are not monks. Monks, it is

true, are not allowed to encourage killing.

Killing is less than ideal. But there are always circumstances when it cannot be avoided.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

bob said:

rambling on about which religion or "scientific" point of view is best.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not question of "best", it's a question of testability. There are tons of things that may be true, which are nevertheless untestable.

Pramaṇa, a term which is generally glossed as "authority", is derived from two Sanskrit roots "pra" and māṇa, and really means "best measurement".

That is all Science can tell us i.e., their best measurements. There is nothing definitive about science, per se. But everyone wants reliable scales.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

smcj said:

Power, all power, is always laced with the threat of violence, the ability to transgress boundaries, whether physical, social, or moral.

Power="the ability to do". A surgeon has the ability, or power, to heal, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but a surgeon can also kill. When you study poisons in order to cure poison, you learn how to poison as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One thing that people seem to be unaware of, because perhaps they are not very clear about the history of Buddhist ideas, is that the so called "siddha" movement largely rose in response to increasing hostility towards Buddhists...

dzogchungpa said:

I understand what you say, and I agree with it. However I think you are using a more restrictive sense of "siddha/siddhi" here than what I, and probably others posting on this thread, have in mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Power, all power, is always laced with the threat of violence, the ability to transgress boundaries, whether physical, social, or moral.

We see these themes again and again the stories of Buddhist siddhas:

Physical boundaries: master over the four elements, etc.

Social boundaries: Kings reduced to beggars like Luipa, brahmins using low caste consorts like Saraha, etc.

Moral boundaries: the five meats, the five nectars, ritual acts of violence like the famous lower activities rites of Vajrakīlaya, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

JKhedrup said:

The legendary battles between buddhist and non-buddhist siddhas always come down to "The fastest siddha in the East". And of course, we only record our victories, not our defeats. For a record of our defeats, we must examine Hindu sources.

Agreed, can you suggest some?

Malcolm wrote:

Take a look at the "The Hardship and Downfall of Buddhism in India" showing that Indian Buddhism was destroyed by Hindus. This book convincingly puts to rest the idea that Buddhism was not destroyed by Hindus but rather by Muslims. It shows, convincingly in my mind, that the long standing and deeply entrenched Brahmanical hostility to Buddhism was in large part responsible for the downfall of Buddhism in India, as recorded in myths and accounts in Hindu texts and archaeology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 14th, 2013 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

What did he say of the individual soldiers who went onto the battlefield and engaged in killing the enemy?

Malcolm wrote:

If they belong to such a virtuous country, they are not at fault, because the violence is forced upon them. Run a search on Pasenadi at access to insight.

seeker242 said:

"Staying at Savatthi. Then King Ajatasattu of Magadha, the son of Queen Videha, raising a fourfold army, marched toward Kasi against King Pasenadi Kosala. King Pasenadi heard, "King Ajatasattu of Magadha, the son of Queen Videha, they say, has raised a fourfold army and is marching toward Kasi against me." So King Pasenadi, raising a fourfold army, launched a counter-attack toward Kasi against King Ajatasattu. Then King Ajatasattu & King Pasenadi fought a battle, and in that battle King Pasenadi defeated King Ajatasattu and captured him alive.

The thought then occurred to King Pasenadi: "Even though King Ajatasattu has wronged me when I have done him no wrong, still he is my nephew. What if I, having confiscated all his elephant troops, all his cavalry, all his chariots, & all his infantry, were to let him go with just his life?" So King Pasenadi — having confiscated all his elephant troops, cavalry, chariots, & infantry — let King Ajatasattu go with just his life."

And if he had taken his life and not let him go? What then? And what does all this have to do with what goes on at a slaughterhouse?

Honestly, I just can't believe you have people on a Buddhist forum actually defending the act of killing...No wonder it's called the dharma ending age...

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think this battle ended with all the lives of Ajasatru's soldiers being spared? They fought a battle. People surely died on both sides.

I can't speak for others, but there are plenty of Buddhist sutras where acts of killing are defended as virtuous, for example, the sea captain story and so on.

I am merely pointing out that the issue is not so simple as "killing is bad".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Meru is not presented as a visionary model in any Buddhist text It is presented by Vasubandhu as empirical fact. Since that cosmology does not conform to what is

universally accessible empirical knowledge, it is relic of another time and another culture that no longer can be entertained as true.

dzogchungpa said:

You seem to accept rebirth. Is that based on universally accessible empirical knowledge?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

No. It's an inferential conclusion about a phenomena of which I have no direct knowledge (I have no recollection of past lives, and couldn't prove it to you even if I did). But I do have a mind, the last I checked (some may disagree of course), and as a matter of inference, is seemed unlikely to me (when I examined the question) that ultimately my stream of consciousness could have emerged from my brain alone (which is a necessary condition for sense cognitions, but in my opinion cannot account for knowing).

M

Should be..."my stream of consciousness could not have emerged..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

What did he say of the individual soldiers who went onto the battlefield and engaged in killing the enemy?

Malcolm wrote:

If they belong to such a virtuous country, they are not at fault, because the violence is forced upon them. Run a search on Pasenadi at access to insight.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Jigme Tsultrim said:

No Seeker, you're in error. "Killing is bad" is not a pan-Buddhist doctrine.

seeker242 said:

Sorry friend, but it is. What deluded Japanese soldiers did or did not do, is irrelevant to what the Buddha himself taught.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha himself taught that a virtuous country had the right to defend itself with violent force if need be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

"Monks, a lay follower should not engage in five types of business. Which five? Business in weapons, business in human beings, business in meat, business in intoxicants, and business in poison."

Why does he not mention vegetable farming? Hmm, I wonder!...

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist monks are forbidden to dig in the ground because of the harm they will cause to small animals, thus they cannot farm, for a monk this is wrong livelihood. Likewise, monks are forbidden to travel in the rains season primarily because of all the small creatures they will kill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One thing that people seem to be unaware of, because perhaps they are not very clear about the history of Buddhist ideas, is that the so called "siddha" movement largely rose in response to increasing hostility towards Buddhists. In fact, it seems it seems that the tales of magical violence match pretty well with the increasing unviability of Buddhism in India. Think on this.

The legends of siddhas in India virtually all have the context of trying to amaze or defeat non-Buddhist opponents. The legendary battles between buddhist and non-buddhist siddhas always come down to "The fastest siddha in the East". And of course, we only record our victories, not our defeats. For a record of our defeats, we must examine Hindu sources.

If we take the example of Virupa -- in the legends of siddhis he displayed for Buddhists, they are generally kind, like crossing a reflecting pond by walking on the lotus leaves. However, when confronting Hindus they are always wrathful, like causing a linga to split in two by prostrating to it, and so on. Eventually, because Virupa was such a badass, Avalokiteśvara intervened, according to the main account of his career, and asked him to stop displaying siddhis because he was freaking people out too much.

Tibetans were fascinated by such stories. When we look to the accounts of Vajrayāna in Sino-japanese Buddhism, we do not see anything like the narrative of conflict and subjugation that we see when Vajrayāna was imported to Tibet.

While the Buddha himself is said to have criticized displays of *iddhipati* as a means to engender faith, as Buddhism lost ground against hostile Shaivaites and Bhagavatis (followers of Vishnu), there is marked increase in such tales. Unfortunately for Indian Buddhists, there simply were not enough Buddhist siddhas to stave off the eventual destruction of Buddhism in India by hostile Hindus and Muslims -- not to mention Central Asia. In reality, if we examine the Buddhist siddha movement as a defensive strategy in order to preserve the faith, it failed. By the the 12th century, even Bodhgaya had been overrun by nonbuddhists. So it seems that the Buddhist siddha movement in the end completely failed at preserving the Dharma in India.

So what does this have to do with Buddhist "inner science"? Of what possible use are siddhis in taming the mind? Of what possible use are siddhis other than as a frightening display of power imbued with the threat of violence?

If you read the accounts of Buddhist siddhas, they are filled with magical violence of the most extreme kind (Tilopa killing small creatures by the side of a river; Gesar slaying hundreds of thousands of Horpas). What is admirable about stopping the sun so that crops in the field burn and animals begin to die of dehydration (Virupa)? What is admirable about the ability to incinerate your opponent with a wrathful glare (Dharmakirti)? Why do we admire this?

Honestly, I think that people should really evaluate what it is that they find so admirable about the ritual violence (that we term "siddhis") that so many Vajrayāna legends are imbued with. People really should evaluate the fact that many of the primary legends of siddhas concern their skill at destructive magical violence as evidence of their qualities of realization.

This reflection should also cause people to reconsider what is meant by Buddhist "inner science". Perhaps we should form a hypothesis (like any good scientist) and subject that hypothesis to testing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Meru is not presented as a visionary model in any Buddhist text. It is presented by Vasubandhu as empirical fact. Since that cosmology does not conform to what is universally accessible empirical knowledge, it is relic of another time and another

culture that no longer can be entertained as true.

dzogchungpa said:

You seem to accept rebirth. Is that based on universally accessible empirical knowledge?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

No. It's an inferential conclusion about a phenomena of which I have no direct knowledge (I have no recollection of past lives, and couldn't prove it to you even if I did). But I do have a mind, the last I checked (some may disagree of course), and as a matter of inference, is seemed unlikely to me (when I examined the question) that ultimately my stream of consciousness could have emerged from my brain alone (which is a necessary condition for sense cognitions, but in my opinion cannot account for knowing).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Things like Meru, which might even have been reasonable inferences once upon a time have stopped being so once Tibetan buddhism joined the world community in 1959.

Karma Dorje said:

Visionary experience != universally accessible empirical knowledge. Collapsing the two is nonsensical.

Malcolm wrote:

Meru is not presented as a visionary model in any Buddhist text It is presented by Vasubandhu as empirical fact. Since that cosmology does not conform to what is universally accessible empirical knowledge, it is relic of another time and another culture that no longer can be entertained as true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Otherwise all this crap about meru, siddhis, magic powers and so on is just useless

prapanca people are entertaining themselves with Because they have nothing better to put their minds to.

dzogchungpa said:

Tell us what you really think, Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Truthfully, even discussing it is useless prapanca.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 8:54 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quite frankly, if Buddhists continue to entertain such naive beliefs, no one will take Buddhism seriously. Basically folks, this is Buddhism's Galileo moment.

Karma Dorje said:

Nobody of your ilk perhaps, but plenty of us mere humans. Yet again you are coming off as if you believe your viewpoint is the only sensible, mature one and everyone else is simply wrong. Frankly, I find you a lot more dogmatic about your opinions than these so-called fundamentalists you are railing against. I'll stick with what I have been taught by a realized master over the opinions of a scholar, no matter how eloquently stated or forcefully argued.

Malcolm wrote:

Its not dogma. When you can show me a cosmic mountain in the middle of space somewhere, or even a human being who can fly unaided through the mere power of their will, then there is something discuss. Otherwise all this crap about meru, siddhis, magic powers and so on is just useless prapanca people are entertaining themselves with Because they have nothing better to put their minds to.

Things like Meru, which might even have been reasonable inferences once upon a time have stopped being so once Tibetan buddhism joined the world community in 1959.

Secondly, a person may be realized about the nature of their minds, utterly free of affliction, and may still be completely mistaken about all kinds of things. Realization does not equal omniscience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 8:35 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, they are fun stories, but in the end the real siddhis are the human qualities of compassion, love and awakening: in other words, the things that make us more human, not superhuman. Apart from the supreme siddhi, the other siddhis are just parlor tricks, even if they are true.

M

Karma Dorje said:

A couple or three millennia ago, the flat earth was regarded as a fact. A few hundred years ago, the heavens were thought to be geocentric rather than heliocentric. Those things that we view as self-evident today may be considered quaint 400 years from now and unrecognizable 2000 years from now.

So why be emphatic about what is possible and close off what is not based on one's own current world view? I would rather keep a sense of wonder and possibility than try to be some sort of hard-boiled denizen of modernity puffed up with the conceit of purported progress. I would rather regard life as a riot of paradoxes and fables than as a scorched earth of foolish consistency.

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite sure in 2000 years humans, if we still exist, will still discover the earth revolves around the sun, and not other way around.

For instance, a common fact that no one in any culture has ever rejected is that there is a sun and a moon. One sun, one moon. Not two, not three. Why do you think that is? Everyone understands that there are two human, biologically determined genders, not three, not four.

There are certain basic facts of our existence which are constant. Those facts are explained better today than they were 2000 years ago. Why fight it with fantasies about continents that only siddhas can fly to and so on? To insist there is a shred of truth in abhidharma meru cosmology, for example, is extremely immature. It is exactly at the same level of thinking as biblical creationism.

Quite frankly, if Buddhists continue to entertain such naive beliefs, no one will take Buddhism seriously. Basically folks, this is Buddhism's Galileo moment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

The fact that a school referred to as Pudgalavadins existed and asserted some type of existent 'self',

even though that is inconsistent with the doctrine of anatta,
regardless of what brought on their demise,
it has absolutely nothing to do with this discussion.

.

Malcolm wrote:
It has everything to do with this discussion.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 3:39 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:

Karma Dorje said:
I am quite happy with the traditional accounts of siddhis, siddhas, etc.

Malcolm wrote:
O, I am happy with them too, they are fun to read.

Do I think they ever happened...miracles of loaves and fishes anyone? Raising Lazarus from the dead? Flying to Jerusalem on an ass? Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon...?

Quite frankly, I have never seen any human being swim through the earth, fly through mountains, fly in the air (except in a plane, etc.), stand in the middle of bonfire unharmed, walk through a wall, stick a kila in a rock, leave a footprint in a stone (and I have seen highly respected Tibetan Lamas laugh at the supposed photographed "miracles" of other lamas who claim to have done so (no not saying who)) and so on.

As I said, they are fun stories, but in the end the real siddhis are the human qualities of compassion, love and awakening: in other words, the things that make us more human, not superhuman. Apart from the supreme siddhi, the other siddhis are just parlor tricks, even if they are true.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 2:24 AM
Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.
Content:
smcj said:
Incidentally, prostrations as a "practice" are Tibetan innovation. This is not a bad thing, but it does need to be recognized as such.

Nylon strings on a classical guitar are an American invention. Nobody wants to go back to cat-gut strings. Sometimes innovation is improvement. But if you tried to put metal strings on a classical guitar you'd collapse the instrument. You've got to know what you're doing. Best to trust the experts.

Malcolm wrote:

My basic point of course, is that I have seen numerous people injure themselves severely with prostrations (knees, backs, necks, wrists). As a Doctor, my motivation is to prevent further injuries so people can practice well and long. The Nalanda style of prostrations (so called half prostrations) is better than that Vikramashila style (so called full prostrations). It is easier on the back, knees and neck.

Sun salutations is better than either in my opinion, because it works all the major joints and channels with little risk of injury done slowly and with care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

So you feel siddhas exist but not the siddhis, since they are all defying the laws of science and common sense?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I think we can all agree that the only important siddhi is the supreme siddhi, i.e., awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 13th, 2013 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

...watering Buddhism down with science and New Age philosophies.

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, I do neither. Buddhism is Buddhism, science is science. One is a religion, the other is an iterative method for advancing our knowledge of the physical universe. Sometimes their paths intersect, but mostly they do not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

So trying to practise what the Buddha taught is now fundamentalism?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all.

Insisting that one must accept as literally true any traditional narratives about the origin of various Buddhist texts (for example, the idea that Nāgārjuna recovers the Prajñāpāramitā from the Nāgā realm "under the ocean") is fundamentalism. Insisting that one must accept that Buddha taught Mahāyāna surrounded by millions of bodhisattvas on Rajagriha or that he taught Vajrayāna literally and personally, either inside a stupa in south India, or in some imaginary devaloka is fundamentalism.

My point is that the teachings in these texts must be able to stand on their own and be able to withstand scrutiny on the basis of the ideas presented in those texts on their own without any reference to or dependence upon some imagined authority. In the end, authority is only as strong as the weakest link in the chain. Thus Ganden Chopel said in regards to the question of authority:

"It is a tiger who testifies on behalf of the lion. It is a yak who testifies on behalf of the tiger. It is a dog who testifies on behalf of the yak. It is a mouse who testifies on behalf of the dog. It is a flea who testifies on behalf of the mouse. Therefore, a flea is the ultimate witness on behalf of all."

Not only that, but the various claims put forth by various factions about what the Buddha taught and where wildly contradict one another, especially when we come to Vajrayāna texts, where, according to late 10th century Indian accounts we have the Buddha flying with his monks to Oḍḍiyāna and granting the Guhyasamāja empowerment to King Indrabhūti, who then, with his kingdom all vanish after achieving enlightenment, only to be replaced by a lake full of nāgās out of which one transforms into a human woman many centuries later, who then travels to South India and imparts the teachings to a South Indian King. (The Nyingma version of the origin of Vajrayāna is completely at odds with this account, involving magical texts that fall from the sky, and so on). I mean these are marvelous stories, but are no more believable than the story of Mahāsiddha Virupa arresting the progress of the sun in the sky while on a drinking binge with his disciple in order to delay the arrival of his bartab.

Therefore, with regard to Buddhist texts, it is my opinion that the best way to approach them, the approach that makes the most sense to me as someone who lives in these texts everyday is to see these texts as products of gradual development and emendation over time. We have many instances of this in the long history of sutra

translation into Chinese. I prefer this approach, rather than believing that these texts are a divine revelation imparted completely within the eighty year lifespan of the undoubtedly remarkable human being, Gautama Siddhārtha.

As I see it, Buddhist sutras and tantras are a remarkable record of human beings, some awakened, others not, working out what awakening means. I see it as documentary evidence of a very human process of self-discovery and self-fulfillment.

But I do not think we need to take the legendary and mythological accounts of Buddha's life, or teachings attributed to him as literal, historical fact. We do not even need to take the cosmological myths presented in the Pali canon as fact. Nor do we need to accept the legends Buddha is portrayed as telling about his past lives as fact. In the same I do not believe for an instant that Padmasambhava was, as it is claimed in numerous biographies, born in the center of a lotus blossom somewhere in modern day Pakistan, or that he was three thousand years old and so on. Nevertheless, I happily recite the seven line prayer, understanding that is meaningful symbolically, as myth, etc. But I certainly do not take it to be a literal portrayal of the facts of the life of a person we call Padmasambhava.

We can, if we so choose, accept these myths and legends as literally true, but to insist to others that they must accept these as literal facts is fundamentalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles to Bodhicitta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You must merely observe reality, see that there is suffering and decide that you want to be as awakened as possible so you are finally useful to someone other than yourself. The rest will take care of itself.

Konchog1 said:

Exactly there. Some days I feel some compassion and some days I do not. But if I follow the Lam Rim procedure of recognizing beings as mothers, remembering kindnesses etc. and generate love, then generate compassion on the basis of that love, I feel stronger compassion than I usually feel. But only for a couple seconds and it isn't progressing stronger.

Malcolm wrote:

We all have good days and bad days.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The name George thus means Guru of Orgyen. The myth or history of Saint George subduing, or slaughtering, the Dragon derives from the legend of Padmasambhava, who is the Guru of Orgyen, i.e. Saint George.

The name George has many variants in european languages, like italian Giorgio, german Jörg & Jürgen, hungarian György, swedish Jörgen, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

This is incredibly silly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:48 PM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no rules, my friend., apart from those we choose to follow.

smcj said:

In my work I sometimes have to go to 3 or 4 different places a week, places I've never been to. They give me directions and a map on how to get there. Nobody forces me to follow their directions, but if I choose not to follow them I can't blame the guy that made the map if I get lost or if I am late. If I take a shortcut I do so at my own peril.

Malcolm wrote:

Maps do not specify if you are to arrive by walking, train, car, bike, bus, helicopter or motorbike.

Incidentally, prostrations as a "practice" are Tibetan innovation. This is not a bad thing, but it does need to be recognized as such.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:16 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Apparently the Pudgalavadins' argument didn't hold up either.

.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that Pudgalavadins asserted a self is sufficient to demolish your claim that all

buddhist schools adhered to the three or four seals, and thus renders your claim that theses are universal tenets in buddhism invalid.

Sorry, this is just a fact. You would do well to study a bit more Buddhist history . The fact that this school was long lived is born out by the fact that they were subject to polemical refutations from the time of Asoka until buddhism perished in India. That their schools did not survive owes everything to the destruction buddhism in India and nothing to successful refutation of their positions by opposing buddhist schools. This is simply a fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 11:51 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, things like this are decided by oneself. If one chooses to follow someone else's idea, still it is one's own choice. Nothing trumps personal authority.

smcj said:

Since this is actual practice we are talking about, where do you draw the line? Can you make up your own mantra? Create a new deity or sadhana?

Malcolm wrote:

There are no rules, my friend., apart from those we choose to follow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Things like this are decided by the practitioner's guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, things like this are decided by oneself. If one chooses to follow someone else's idea, still it is one's own choice. Nothing trumps personal authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Witness the *growth* of Islam and fundamentalist Christianity in recent years.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is exactly a result of the crisis of Modernity. Buddhists are just a little late on the scene, hence the phenomena of fledgling Buddhist fundamentalism that we see growing in groups like NKT and so on, and the attitudes of certain fundamentalist Nyingmapas etc.

Karma Dorje said:

What it makes clear is that our own personal understanding is not necessarily tied to, and might actually be counter to, what is good for the institutional survival of Buddhism. The fundamentalism may serve an important purpose in propagating the institutional forms, even though I don't intend to have them over for a beer and a BBQ any time soon.

Malcolm wrote:

If this is the case, the institutional form isn't worth saving. Fundamentalism is basically religious cancer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Witness the *growth* of Islam and fundamentalist Christianity in recent years.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is exactly a result of the crisis of Modernity. Buddhists are just a little late on the scene, hence the phenomena of fledgling Buddhist fundamentalism that we see growing in groups like NKT and so on, and the attitudes of certain fundamentalist Nyingmapas etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Personally, when asked I just say I am a Hindu which is true....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:55 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In order to demonstrate that these three or four are not universal amongst so called "Buddhists".

PadmaVonSamba said:
But you just established that they are:
anicca=impermanence
dukkha=suffering
anatta=no self

Malcolm wrote:
You are apparently not listening very well. I never stated once that these were shared amongst all Buddhist schools.

In fact, Pudgalavadins, a Buddhist school, assert that there is indeed a real self that experiences rebirth. They were once the most populous school in all India. They do not accept the third "seal" above.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:48 AM
Title: Re: Obstacles to Bodhicitta
Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:
My understanding is that bodhicitta is selfless compassion.

Malcolm wrote:
Bodhicitta is specifically the arousal [utpada] of the intent or mind [citta] to attain awakening [bodhi]. That has three forms: the intent to awaken as an arhat, as a pratyekabuddha, or as a Samyaksambuddha.

The wish to awaken as a Samyak Sambuddha is special bodhicitta, the kind cultivated by bodhisattvas.

Compassion is its condition. However, as Dharmakirti notes, love and compassion do not have the ability to cause one to achieve full awakening, i.e. the awakening of a Samyaksambuddha. One needs something more, and that something is Mahāyāna bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:43 AM
Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
In short, Buddhism's "grace" period or probationary period in the West is over and done with. In order for Buddhism to hold its own in the free market of ideas, it must be able to

do so without any recourse to traditional authority. If it fails at this, it will fail the test of modernity and as human civilization continues to advance and develop, Buddhism will become yet another footnote to history.

Karma Dorje said:

Has fundamentalist Islam or Christianity met this test?

They don't seem to have a problem growing, regardless of "philosophical moribundity".

Malcolm wrote:

Death throes of a dying beast.

Karma Dorje said:

I am not so convinced of it's relevancy for the bulk of the 7 billion.

Malcolm wrote:

Only time will tell.

Karma Dorje said:

The problem Buddhism faces here is not that it relies too much on traditional Indian and Tibetan epistemological premises.

Malcolm wrote:

So you don't agree that Buddhism is facing a crisis of modernity? Sure seems like it to me.

Karma Dorje said:

It is that people here are conditioned at an emotional and instinctual level to identify with the Abrahamic narratives.

Malcolm wrote:

The Abrahamic narrative thing is overstated, IMO. It is, to use a term borrowed from Witzel, just another form of the Laurasian Ur-myth that all European, Asian and American cosmological narratives share.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:35 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Unknown said:

...in order to do what?

Malcolm wrote:

In order to demonstrate that these three or four are not universal amongst so called "Buddhists".

Unknown said:

Then tell me, by what cognitive means is the arhat aware that he is an arhat?

Malcolm wrote:

His mind, what else? Surely you are not going to now suggest that arhats lack the five aggregates?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

and yet you have listed three of the four I mentioned.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't claim they were universal in Buddhism. You did.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Yes, and they are.

Malcolm wrote:

So all I have to do is provide one countervailing example?

PadmaVonSamba said:

And again,

do you suppose an arhat is aware he is an arhat?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. For example, the Buddha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 9:17 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

and yet you have listed three of the four I mentioned.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't claim they were universal in Buddhism. You did.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Unknown said:

"the conviction that rituals can cause moral purity....

Malcolm wrote:

That pretty much does in a lot of Vajrayāna ritual purity rituals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

How about this:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Basic_Points_Unifying_the_Theravada_and_Mahayana?

Malcolm wrote:

That works if you are a Theravadin or Mahāyāni, it does not work so well if you are a Dzogchenpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:33 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is much easier to define what is not Buddhist than what is "Buddhist" in fact.

dzogchungpa said:

What do you think about this attempt:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=39&t=14040&p=184779#p184779?>

Malcolm wrote:

It is definitely more comprehensive than merely relying on the four seals. But it's not perfect, though it is a start.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:26 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles to Bodhicitta

Content:

Konchog1 said:

How can you generate without force?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, it is very easy. Just look around you.

In other words, you cannot generate bodhicitta from formulas found in books.

You must merely observe reality, see that there is suffering and decide that you want to be as awakened as possible so you are finally useful to someone other than yourself. The rest will take care of itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I don't think the four seals are a sufficient criteria: for example, the Sāṃkhya school regards conditioned phenomena as being nonself, suffering, and impermanent (the manner in which they do so is a bit different than the Buddha's formulation, nevertheless...), and the experience of puruṣa can easily be equated with the unsupported consciousness of the Pali suttas...so...

dzogchungpa said:

I recently read this in DJKR's Buddha Nature book: Buddhists talk about "not truly existent", and I think that in this present day, this is like the ace up our sleeves, our trump card. It is what distinguishes the Buddhist view. However, only the Sāṃkhyas, the high Sāṃkhyas, have a view that is so close to the Buddhist view as to be nearly indistinguishable.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he is referring to the early non-theistic Sāṃkhya of the Rishi Kapila, rather than the later theistic Sāṃkhya.

But this merely goes to show that it is difficult to define a universal core set of Buddhist doctrines that are uniquely and distinctly Buddhist.

It is much easier to define what is not Buddhist than what is "Buddhist" in fact.

Universe created by God? Ok not Buddhist. And that's about it.

Actually, if there is a teaching in Buddhism that is uniquely the Buddha's, it is dependent origination i.e. where this exists, that exists, where that arose, this arose; where that does not exist, this does not exist, with the ceasing of that, this ceased, etc.

But not all "Buddhist" schools accept this as the sine qua non of Dharma. For example, in Dzogchen, the twelve limbs are considered merely a gateway for deluded people, but not the sine qua non of Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

futerko said:

He did write a book about it - "What makes you not a Buddhist", where he discusses the four seals - a definition I seem to remember you using to defend Stephen Batchelor's position a while back.

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, I was doing so because of what other people accepted, not what I accept.

futerko said:

Yes, but I think it's safe to say that DKR has outlined his position concerning your earlier question.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I don't think the four seals are a sufficient criteria: for example, the Saṃkhya school regards conditioned phenomena as being nonself, suffering, and impermanent (the manner in which they do so is a bit different than the Buddha's formulation, nevertheless...), and the experience of purusha can easily be equated with the unsupported consciousness of the Pali suttas...so...

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

futerko said:

He did write a book about it - "What makes you not a Buddhist", where he discusses the four seals - a definition I seem to remember you using to defend Stephen Batchelor's position a while back.

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, I was doing so because of what other people accepted, not what I accept.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is in fact no true standard set of Buddhist doctrines that universally apply to all instances of what we call Buddhism.

PadmaVonSamba said:

How did you determine this?

There are, in fact, four basic tenets common to all schools of Buddhism.

They are commonly referred to as the Four Seals:

All conditioned phenomena are impermanent.

The nature of conditioned (*should be afflicted) phenomena is suffering (duhhka)

All phenomena lack inherent existence (*should be not-self)

The true nature of the mind is free from suffering (nirvana) (*should be nirvana is peaceful)

Malcolm wrote:

No, sorry to contradict you but...

The Theravadins do not have a formulation using the the fourth seal. That only exists in Mahāyāna.

Theravadas use the three seals: anicca, dukkha and anatta.

What is interesting here is of course when seeking to find a common ground among Buddhist schools we depend on doctrines also found in Hindu schools such as Sāṃkhya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

But just out of curiosity, what do you mean by "generic Buddhism"?

If you mean that there isn't a particular school or lineage or sect called "Generic" then you are correct.

Malcolm wrote:

There is in fact no true standard set of Buddhist doctrines that universally apply to all instances of what we call Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So you believe that there is no core of beliefs and practices that can be defined as Buddhist? That there is nothing that all Buddhists can agree on? Dependent origination, for example?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that -- I said there was no generic Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no generic "Buddhism".

Sherab Dorje said:

Of course there is.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Five precepts: an inquiry

Content:

Mouse Soldier said:

What does Buddhism have to say about when life begins?

Malcolm wrote:

It begins at conception. Therefore, Buddhist women need to think long and hard before committing to an abortion. That said, since I do not believe in legislating religious belief into law, I am pro-choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

I think you are wrong, I think the Upadesa is the oldest form of Dzogchen. Semde with it aim to separate itself from Tantric teachings is in my eyes a later development.

Malcolm wrote:

You can think what you like dear Magnus, but the man ngag de texts, all of them being termas, are all demonstrably later than the bodhicitta texts, with the rig pa rang shar and the sgra thal gyur being among the latest of all (no earlier than the 11th century).

Secondly, you are incorrect about "sems sde" trying to separate itself from Anuyoga and so on. Atiyoga, as Rongzom says, is "a commentary" of the lower yānas, as well as their definitive meaning.

But this is all besides the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's inner science and the results of the path can be proven to oneself by practising the methods.

Malcolm wrote:

This is what Scientology says as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Does that sound like "reactionary rhetoric" from someone suffering from "religious and cultural insecurity"? I am very sympathetic with what you have said in this thread, but honestly I feel that you are misrepresenting DJKR.

Malcolm wrote:

I was merely using Dzongsar Khyentse's interview as example of what I find to be a reactionary rhetoric which stems from an overall religious and cultural insecurity I have found amongst Tibetan religious professionals.

He also does not specify this "main philosophy of Buddhism" that must remain "intact".

Perhaps he can drop in and tell us what he feels that might be.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

well, if you like simpler Dzogchen, stick with the bodhicitta texts, since they are most likely the ones which actually have a root in a historical person named "Vajraprahe".

heart said:

I am fine with what I do, thanks. I don't share your or Germano's ideas of the origin of Dzogchen.

/magnus

pensum said:

I'm assuming, Magnus, that you don't realize that Vajraprahe is no other than Garab Dorje. In Tibetan texts his name is rendered in Sanskrit as either Prahevajra or in some of the early texts that Malcolm has been researching as Vajraprahe. Or do you disagree that Garab Dorje most likely was an actual person and that the main, if not all (Buddhist anyway, Bon may be an exception), Dzogchen lineages can be traced back to him (which i believe is Malcolm's view)?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is my view that these persons: Garab Dorje, Manjushrimitra and Shri Simha are historical persons. It is also my view that Dzogchen as an intimate instruction must come from that source. I do not imagine however that all the texts attributed to Garab Dorje are actually by him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

Of course know that dear pensum. Germano and Malcolm share the view that Dzogchen, or at least the Upadesa tradition, is an Tibetan invention. I don't share that view. Not because Tibetan invention would in itself be a bad thing, I am pretty sure that there are many elaborations of Tibetan origin in Dzogchen, but because the insistence on lineage in the Tibetan cultural sphere. I also don't think Dzogchen developed from semde to longde to upadesa or that hinayana developed to mahayana and further to vajrayana, it is just a comfortable darwinistic view that our society is full of. But I am not a scholar and what I think is of little consequence.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

What you call the view that Germano and I share is in fact the Western academic consensus, current even among Western academics who nevertheless are practitioners.

So called sems sde and klong sde are contemporary, they are but two branches of the same teaching of the same Tibetan teacher, Vairocana -- there is nothing philosophically remarkable about klong sde that separates it from so called sems sde. In short, sems sde and klong sde are different streams of the same basic teaching.

Man ngag sde however is a different matter. It is not a Tibetan "invention". That is too crude. It is a reworking of Dzogchen based on the second contact of Tibetan civilization with late Indian Vajrayāna. It is essentially gsar ma rDzogs chen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

The Mahayana is not an evolution of the Dharma in the Nikayas.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not an evolution of the Dharma in the Nikayas, it is an evolution of the Dharma outside of the Nikāyas.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Both were taught by Buddha Shakyamuni...

Malcolm wrote:

Impossible, I say.

Tsongkhapa said:

The Dharma does not evolve because the nature of samsara and nirvana does not change.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma has demonstrably evolved over the centuries in order to cope with changes in human cultures, economics, and civilizations. It is changing now as we speak. To refuse to see this is voluntary blindness.

The meaning of nirvana has changed over time (once a desiderata, then an extreme to be avoided). Even the meaning of samsara has changed (once something to eschew, then something not to be abandoned).

Tsongkhapa said:

The meaning of Dharma does not change, but the presentation may do to suit the capacity and lifestyle of those who are listening.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as "inherent meaning".

Tsongkhapa said:

For example the lamrim teachings of Venerable Atisha and Je Tsongkhapa present a complete path to liberation and enlightenment that will not change in meaning, but may be presented differently as times degenerate and the wisdom of living beings wanes.

Malcolm wrote:

The very meaning of "Buddhahood" has changed over time.

++++++

Basically, Buddhism and Buddhists are facing the crisis of modernity.

Like Christianity, Buddhism has no hope of relying upon the pre-modern myths and fables which provided its narratives. The vast majority of modern people simply will not accept the narratives traditional Buddhism has proffered for explaining our world. Buddhism[s], which once provided a complete explanation of the universe, is/are no longer capable of doing so.

Buddhism, like Christianity before it, will be forced to discover new meaning for itself, and will need to forge new narratives for itself, if it hopes to survive in the modern world. Of course Buddhism has the materials at hand to do so, like Christianity.

In other words, the validity or absence of validity of Mahāyāna does not depend on its origin legend. If Mahāyāna depends on its origin legends for its validity, then it is intellectually moribund and philosophically meagre. If on the other hand Mahāyāna does not depend upon its origin legend for its validity, then it is intellectually vital and philosophically robust. The same observation can be made about those who require the

origin legend of Mahāyāna to be literally true, they are neither intellectually vital nor philosophically robust because they are incapable of defending Mahāyāna ideas purely on their own terms without recourse to some imagined authority.

The corollary however does not hold; the successful defense of Mahāyāna ideas on their own terms does not validate the legends of Mahāyāna origins.

Again, this begs the question: just how many Mahāyānas are there? How many Vajrayānas are there?

In short, Buddhism's "grace" period or probationary period in the West is over and done with. In order for Buddhism to hold its own in the free market of ideas, it must be able to do so without any recourse to traditional authority. If it fails at this, it will fail the test of modernity and as human civilization continues to advance and develop, Buddhism will become yet another footnote to history.

In order to prevent that from happening, Buddhists must in fact be the harshest critics of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

I rather sit at the feet of Garab Dorje and receive Dzogchen personally.

Malcolm wrote:

Me too, but it didn't happen and is not going to happen, so why fantasize?

heart said:

Oh, I don't fantasize, just stating what end of evolution has the most value to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

well, if you like simpler Dzogchen, stick with the bodhicitta texts, since they are most likely the ones which actually have a root in a historical person named "Vajraprahe".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

So if something "develops" or "evolve" it gets more complicated or diversified or just

different but not better except randomly so?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Better/worse are human judgements. Simplicity/complexity are observable phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sang Chod

Content:

Kunzang said:

Regarding the question about a requirement for empowerment for practicing Riwo Sang Chod: the version I practice, and I think it's the most common version, has self-visualization as Padmasambhava (i.e., as Padma Thodtrengtsal). So somebody more knowledgeable should correct me if I'm wrong, but even though the RSC itself doesn't require its own empowerment (just the lung), don't you need prior empowerment before you can do any self-visualization practice?

Malcolm wrote:

The original version does not contain a self-visualization at all. The edition penned by Dudjom R., does, and in order to use it as such, one must at least have the lung, if not any suitable Guru P empowerment such as the Rigzin Sogdrup etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Simon E. said:

And the most well known 'recognition' that Lama Zopa made didn't work out too well, did it ?

Indrajala said:

Does that reflect more on the recognized tulku or the Lama who recognized him?

Simon E. said:

In my view it reflects on the whole process really...

Lets face it we largely know about Hita because he is a westerner...the attrition rate of 'reluctant' tulkus might be a big proportion actually.

Malcolm wrote:

"Nature habitually overproduces..."

-- Ezra Pound.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

I rather sit at the feet of Garab Dorje and receive Dzogchen personally.

Malcolm wrote:

Me too, but it didn't happen and is not going to happen, so why fantasize?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 12th, 2013 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Simon E. said:

And the most well known ' recognition ' that Lama Zopa made didn't work out too well, did it ?

Indrajala said:

Does that reflect more on the recognized tulku or the Lama who recognized him?

Malcolm wrote:

Equally upon both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

heart said:

The idea of evolution is that everything becomes better for most beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all.

There are two major definitions here:

1. the process by which different kinds of living organisms are thought to have developed and diversified from earlier forms during the history of the earth.
2. the gradual development of something, esp. from a simple to a more complex form.

The idea of biological evolution is covered by definition one.

Systems of belief and thought, such as Dzogchen, Christianity, Santeria, modern science, communism, free markets, etc. are covered by the definition two.

For example, so called "sems sde" is comparatively simple when contrasted with man ngag sde. Mahāyāna is comparatively more complex than the Buddhism expressed in the Nikāyas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles to Bodhicitta

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Any advice?

Malcolm wrote:

Don't force. Anyway, bodhicitta is not something you can contrive. You either want to become an awakened person to benefit others or you don't, and some days are better than others when you are an ordinary person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

tatpurlusa said:

Dzogchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Ditto.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Rather than: "I am a buddhist"

how about: "I follow (or agree with) the teachings of buddhism"

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddhism?

PadmaVonSamba said:

whichever buddhism you follow.

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no generic "Buddhism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 11:11 PM

Title: "...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

Content:

JKhedrup said:

The level of scholarship and debate necessary in the great [Tibetan] institutions requires a high degree of doubt and critical thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but it has strictly defined parameters. Despite all the deep learning, critical acumen, and doubt your Geshe may bring to the table, in the end, they are merely expected to master what is already accepted as true according to a consensus. Like musicians, they are merely expected to become expert at playing the scales. They are neither expected nor encouraged to open up whole new fields of learning. They are expected merely to be vessels conveying the wisdom of one generation to another, unaltered like an impression from a seal. Now, do not think that in my view this has no value. It definitely has value. It is a part of human culture and learning.

However, most of the classically educated Tibetans I know have a very hard time with the idea of evolution. They have difficulty accepting that modern humans come from Africa, and that all languages also originally come from Africa and that the pattern of human migration from Africa can be mathematically tracked. Indeed, they have difficulty with Science in general (all the while happily using the fruits of scientific endeavor in the form of electricity, cell phones, antibiotics, and so on).

This is largely because up until recently most educated Tibetans are educated into a pre-modern view of the world that includes Mt. Meru, the Buddhist myth of the origin of humans in devas whose bodies gel and thicken due to their craving for the sweet "cream of the earth" (sa zhag) on the surface of the planet and so on.

There is no fault in all this, of course, but it is important to remember that there are bound to be vast differences in the way persons like ourselves, raised and educated in a post-modern civilization will view the world when compared to those who have pre-modern educations.

For example, a common theme among Tibetan teachers is the oft repeated trope:

"...but the science of Buddhism will never change."

-- Dzongsar Khyentse

http://www.lifepositive.com/Spirit/Buddhism/Through_the_Lens_of_Reality112005.asp

"Why will Buddhism never change?", we ask; and answer as always is "Because Buddhism is based on wisdom."

Of course, anyone who has studied history will instantly recognize this to be a statement that is at best, very naive. Buddhism has undergone constant change and evolution from the beginning.

Even more questionable is the arrogation of Buddhism as a "science". It is not science, it never was and never will be. Buddhism, is, in its best aspect, a yogic tradition; at worst, a religious dogma. Buddhism may indeed have some ideas which are compatible with the worldview informed by modern science, but it equally entertains many beliefs which are not falsifiable in any respect, and hence must be considered non-scientific (which does not mean false, rather merely empirically untestable).

Now, of course, Dzongsar Khyentse can be forgiven for referring to Buddhism as a "science" because of the use of the term *adhyātmavidyā* (*nang rig*) translated as so-called "inner science" where the term "science" is used to translate the term "*vidyā*".

We must however see statements like Dzongsar Khyentse's for what they are: reactionary rhetoric which misses the target.

Modern science, as we know, is a method of coming up with predicative models. If one's predictions fail, one's model is defective, and one's hypothesis is either abandoned or revised by incorporating the results of one's failure. It is an iterative process, as we all know.

However, there is, in my estimation a religious and cultural insecurity which is responsible for sentiments like Dzongar Khyentse's, a sentiment right at home with similar sentiments about the Bible expressed by Christian Fundamentalists. It is an eternalization of tradition. Stating that Buddhism will never or has never changed is like asserting that words of the Bible or the Koran are infallible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Rather than: "I am a buddhist"

how about: "I follow (or agree with) the teachings of buddhism"

.
. .

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddhism?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 12:15 PM

Title: Re: Denying you're a Buddhist to outsiders

Content:

padma norbu said:

I have occasionally in the past few years started just saying "I'm not really a Buddhist, though" to friends and extended family whenever they ask me about all my books and thangkas and statues...

seeker242 said:

Do they believe you? I probably wouldn't if you had Buddha statues and Buddha pictures all over the place. Does it really matter that friends and family understand the technical differences of Dzogchen vs Buddhism? That sound like a long, complicated conversation, one they probably would not understand.

padma norbu said:

They probably think I'm weird and full of crap like a new age hippy or something. I think this is better than them thinking I'm really a buddhist because I think the professional buddhists who wear robes and stuff do a much better job setting an example than I do. Yes, I could try to set a better example, but it's just not natural for me to be a teacher. If I ever found myself in that position, I'd probably abuse the power more and more with each passing year.

Malcolm wrote:

To nonbuddhists I say freely I am Buddhist. But I am not really a "buddhist". I am a practitioner of Dharma, not a follower of a school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for postration.

Content:

supermaxv said:

Well, in my Ngondro materials from my refuge lama, there are specific guidelines and teachings in regards to the proper forms of prostrations for Ngondro accumulation.

Malcolm wrote:

These things are customs, not Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

So, can you just answer the question? Would it matter to you if Zoroastrianism influenced Buddhism? If so, why?

Malcolm wrote:

It would not matter; but it didn't — not in any meaningful way that I can see.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

I mean, what are you even arguing about?

Malcolm wrote:

Vedanta originally referred the Upanishads [End of the Vedas], only two of which are pre-Buddhist (Brihadaranyaka and the Candogya).

However as a _school_, it is post- buddhist by many centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 7:14 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

So, the Vajra appeared in Vedanta prior to the existence of Vajrayana...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and the Vajra appeared in Buddhism before Vedanta existed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Besides invisiblediamond, would anybody care either way? It doesn't seem like anyone really cares in this thread, they are just stating why it the idea is demonstrably factually incorrect. If it influenced Dzogchen the way Vedanta influenced Vajrayana, it wouldn't actually matter to anyone, right?

Just want to clear this up.

Malcolm wrote:

Who says Vedanta influenced Vajrayāna?

padma norbu said:

The Vajra (thunderbolt) is from Hindu origin, is it not? Then, we have the various deities that were assimilated into Vajrayana like Saraswati, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

The vajra is not "Hindu" it is Vedic, and is a shared mytheme in all Indian religions, just like Saraswati, Tārā and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for prostration.

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Is it actually acceptable to do them that way?

Bump

heart said:

No, of course not. Different traditions.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course it is acceptable. A prostration is a prostration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Does Dzogchen have Persian or Zoroastrian influences?

Content:

padma norbu said:

Besides invisiblediamond, would anybody care either way? It doesn't seem like anyone really cares in this thread, they are just stating why it the idea is demonstrably factually incorrect. If it influenced Dzogchen the way Vedanta influenced Vajrayana, it wouldn't actually matter to anyone, right?

Just want to clear this up.

Malcolm wrote:

Who says Vedanta influenced Vajrayāna?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

Look at the west. We still flock to Thor. Where did that come from?

Malcolm wrote:

Marvel Comics.

invisiblediamond said:

We still believe in a work ethic. Where did that come from?

Malcolm wrote:

John Calvin.

invisiblediamond said:

Bonpo say, Shang Shung people were culturally more Persian. This is where dharma met persia and had a baby.

Malcolm wrote:

That is silly. Zhang zhung was literally next door to Kashmir.

Occam's razor, baby.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

To clarify, DC and Z share unique ideas. This is from some where. If not from Z itself, then from what came before and it was so old it was just like the basic world view, or there was some cross pollination with Persian ascetics who must have crossed paths with Shang Shung meditators.

Malcolm wrote:

No. they really do not. Dzogchen is non-theistic. Dzogchen is not eternalist. Dzogchen uses the Indian scheme of the five elements, not the Zoroastrian scheme of seven elements which I posted to you.

I think you are tripping on this one.

Ok, over and out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

So where from in Africa do colors and elements meet? My research makes this a North Central Asian Aryan motif.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://archive.constantcontact.com/fs012/1101454195791/archive/1104070256872.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

From what? That what is the root cultural bias that DC seems to unwind. Bc once it got to the borderlands with Persia, Z ideas were woven in.

Malcolm wrote:

They split as in "went their separate ways".

Dzogchen is based on Indian Antecedents which then were further developed in Tibet in complete absence of any influence from Zoroastrianism, which by the time period you are talking about. We do not have any record in Tibetan, Chinese or any other language of a major contact between Tibetans and Zoroastrians. Zoroastrians strictly do not proselytize. We do have some evidence of contact between Tibetans and Manichaeans in Khotan however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

I don't believe you. Could be much older, by 10,000 years.

Malcolm wrote:

Then, inexplicably, you are being a knucklehead. And the above is total new age bullshit fueled by some very strong weed, I am sure.

Ok, I am done with this thread because it has degenerated into total nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

OddiyanaIsIndia said:

I see the core error of InvisibleDiamond.

He doesn't understand geography or borders of pre-1947 India.

invisiblediamond said:

These comments are retarded bc I'm talking about PreVedic time.

Malcolm wrote:

Look, all mythologies come from a common source in Africa 130,000 years ago.

You need to read Witzel's book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

Z influence bc it's that old and pinioned between both regions.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote][quote][/quote]

Dude, the ancient Indo-aryan and the Ancient Iranians were enemies. Not friends. They split.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It's fascinating.

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of fascinating things. But mixing up Zoroastrianism with Dzogchen? Really, there is no solid basis for this.

invisiblediamond said:

Do the Maya equate color and elements? I know of know other two groups who have this idea. They live in the same region. These are clearly coming from a common cultural root. Failing to see this is fantasizing about one's tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh for christ's sake -- the Chinese also equate their elements and color, and so to the Greeks (black, red, yellow and white).

Mayan elements:

East – Red : Father Sun, the Way of the Visionary: Reed, Knowledge, Crocodile, Serpent, Offering

West – Blue/Black: Grandmother Moon/Ocean, the Way of the Teacher: Monkey, Bird, Rainstorm, Dawn, Deer

South – Yellow: Mother Earth, the Way of the Healer: Road, Wisdom, Sun, Net, Seed

North – White: Father Sky, the Way of the Sacred Warrior: Jaguar, Flint, Wind, Death, Dog

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

They are missing the anthropological evidence so their text based analysis, since texts are dubious, sheds rather little light on what may or may not have really happened.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so what is your archaeological evidence to proves an Iranian source for certain aspects of Dzogchen, namely body of light(Since everything else in Dzogchen is squarely Buddhist like emptiness, three kāyas, buddhas, bodhisattvas, etc.)?

Unless you want to try and convince us that all Mahāyāna is really just Zoroastrianism in drag.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:
invisiblediamond said:
It's fascinating.

Malcolm wrote:
There are all kinds of fascinating things. But mixing up Zoroastrianism with Dzogchen?
Really, there is no solid basis for this.

Anyway, this thread has been sunk by useless speculation.

BTW Mahāmudra guys. If you really take seriously what your citations say -- then why bother with gradualism and defending it.

However, I must point out to you that it is really not possible to find the notion of primordial buddhhood in Mahamudra texts explained in the unique style of Dzogchen.

Its ok. Its not a competition. Fundamentally, we can all agree that Dzogchen and Mahamudra are describing the same state. But the paths are different.

Greg, your citations are ok, but you really should have cited Virupa:

All sentient beings are emanations of mahāmudrā,
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.

and:

Since realism is destroyed in its own state, one is liberated from samsara and nirvana.
Since vidyā is pure in the basis, it is called "Perfect Buddhahood."
Since phenomena and mind are exhausted in the state of exhaustion, therefore it is
explained as "nirvana",
uncontrived, unchanging, totally liberated from everything to be given up or to attain.

--Lion Doha

You guys who claim to be practitioners of Mahāmudra really need to be poked every now and again.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 3:43 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
invisiblediamond said:
I need to see the evidence. .

Malcolm wrote:

Paul, with all due respect, this is a preposterous thing to for you to say. You engage in wild speculation and then claim to need to see evidence?

invisiblediamond said:

I'm inferring from what the evidence shows. The similarities to Persian mysticism is unmistakeable.

Malcolm wrote:

First, there is no Persian Mysticism. Parsis have not lived in Iran for centuries. They mostly live in Western India. Sure, under the Shah some were invited back, but then it stopped. There are only 30 thousand Parsis in Iran, who all were invited back by the Shah.

Second, the notion of five elements of the physical body reverting to light clearly is found in oral instructions connected to the Cakrasamvara completion stage practices that are contemporary with the Dzogchen tantras that treat the same idea.

Secondly, the notion that the five element vāyus of the body have color is widespread in India Buddhist tantra and intimate instructions. So there are plenty of places where these ideas about rainbow body/body of light can be sourced in India Buddhist texts.

Third, even your presentation of the elements of Zoroastrianism is dramatically wrong.

Sure, I can accept that ideas like Sukhavati and so on were influenced by Persian culture, no problem.

But Zoroastrianism and Dzogchen are incompatible. It is simply irresponsible speculation on your part to continue this way. You have no evidence, you have no proof.

invisiblediamond said:

I won't follow the self deceived and self professed.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't need to follow the self-deceived, your are doing an excellent job of deceiving yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It's a good thing I'm not reputable then. I don't believe these tall tales. I don't trust historical accounts. Many of these folks say they come from Greeks. But they don't as born out by genetic testing. They are indigenous. So accounts can't be trusted.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? Are you high? First you reject that Dzogchen is indigenous to "India". Then you claim, with no evidence at all, that it is Zoroastrian influenced on the basis of some fairly unintelligible account written in the sixties about Zoroastrian mysticism on the basis of the five elements reverting to light, which is interesting but not conclusive in any sense.

Then you reject early Tibetan accounts of the importation of Dzogchen to Tibet based on what? Your "feeling"? Your years of dedicated research on comparative religion and mastery of world history?

invisiblediamond said:

I believe the Proto-Aryan elements are part of maghada. The PreVedics revere the elements and nature.

Malcolm wrote:

You are mixing up so many periods of history, so many cultures, here it is really insane. You must be smoking some really strong weed.

There is no reason to believe that there was a teaching called "atiyoga" prior to the late 6th or 7th century. But there is every reason to accept that it was brought to Tibet by Vairocana in the late 8th.

Doctrines like "the body of light" occur rather late in the textual history of Dzogchen. If they do have Persian Influence at all, it could only be from Central Asian Manichaeans. The other possible influence is the mother tantras, specifically the śrī-vajraḍāka-nāma-mahātantrarāja.

invisiblediamond said:

Dzogchen may very well be the same thing for this Persian influenced group. Based on this I'm pretty doubtful about these yantras.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you smoking some Bonpo crack. Did you hang out with Geshe Chagphur recently or something?

I respect Bon, but their Dzogchen is entirely Buddhist in origin.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

I need to see the evidence. .

Malcolm wrote:

Paul, with all due respect, this is a preposterous thing to for you to say. You engage in wild speculation and then claim to need to see evidence?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Just out of curiosity, does 'Oddiyana', the place name, have anything to do with the 'Uddiyana' of yoga's Uddiyana Bandha?

Malcolm wrote:

Possibly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 11th, 2013 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It would be difficult to pigeon-hole Swat as "culturally Indian." Then, as now, it had its distinct idiosyncrasies that made it seem a little far North of Indian.

Malcolm wrote:

Woo-Chang, or Udyana. Monasteries, and Their Ways. Traces of Buddha.

After crossing the river, (the travellers) immediately came to the kingdom of Woo-chang, which is indeed (a part) of North India. The people all use the language of Central India, "Central India" being what we should call the "Middle Kingdom." The food and clothes of the common people are the same as in that Central Kingdom. The Law of Buddha is very (flourishing in Woo-chang). They call the places where the monks stay (for a time) or reside permanently Sangharamas; and of these there are in all 500, the monks being all students of the hinayana. When stranger bhikshus arrive at one of them, their wants are supplied for three days, after which they are told to find a resting-place for themselves.

<http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/f/fa-hien/f15l//contents.html>

invisiblediamond said:

If there is a strong influence of Z in DC...

Malcolm wrote:

No respectable, competent scholar thinks Zoroastrianism has a "strong" influence on

Dzogchen. Dzogchen is Buddhadharma. Its origins are strictly from the Indo-Buddhist cultural sphere.

In the medium history of the Vajra Bridge (klong sde), it describes nine regions (glings) in "rGya gar" (pre-partition subcontinental India including Indo-China) eight of which are sited from the center, which is of course Vajrasana: Bangla in the east, Bhaitala in the south; Orgyen in the west; Kashmir in the north; Khams bu gLing (Kampuchea) in the south east; Zangs gling (the copper country, Visnagar in Gujarat?) in the south west. Zahor in the northwest; Kamarupa in the northeast — with Vajrasana in the center of all of these.

This text further asserts that rGya gar is the source of Dzogchen; in particular, Northwestern Orgyen.

The earliest accounts we have of Garab Dorje, in the Wheel that Ascertains the Yānas (found in the Bairo rgyud 'bum, vol. nga) records that he was born to a princess from Northwestern region of Orgyen who was a Buddhist nun.

The earliest accounts state that Mañjuśrimitra was from Shri Lanka, but studied at Nalanda (founded in the 5th century AD, and all accounts describe Mañjuśrimitra as being a scholar here). Manjushrimitra meets Garab Dorje in a place within Orgyen called Danakosha, which is held to be on the shores of the great outer ocean, which can only be the Arabian Sea, somewhere on the coast of modern Pakistan.

Shri Simha was an Indian. Despite later Nyinthig accounts that he came from "rgya nag" and the attempt of some modern authors to site him as being from Khotan, the earliest accounts we have about this master indicate that he was an Indian.

We have no real reason to doubt the historicity of these three masters, especially Shri Simha, whom Vairocana met.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It would be difficult to pigeon-hole Swat as "culturally Indian." Then, as now, it had its distinct idiosyncrasies that made it seem a little far North of Indian.

Malcolm wrote:

Woo-Chang, or Udyana. Monasteries, and Their Ways. Traces of Buddha.

After crossing the river, (the travellers) immediately came to the kingdom of Woo-chang, which is indeed (a part) of North India. The people all use the language of Central India, "Central India" being what we should call the "Middle Kingdom." The food and clothes of the common people are the same as in that Central Kingdom. The Law of Buddha is

very (flourishing in Woo-chang). They call the places where the monks stay (for a time) or reside permanently Sangharamas; and of these there are in all 500, the monks being all students of the hinayana. When stranger bhikshus arrive at one of them, their wants are supplied for three days, after which they are told to find a resting-place for themselves.

<http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/f/fa-hien/f15l//contents.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

In the link I posted, the College is telling the meat industry to stop lying to people. You are implying that the meat industry is sponsoring people who tell that same meat industry to stop being liars? That is unheard of! The meat industry would never admit to being liars. But of course, this exchange is going nowhere. So you can dismiss my statements, and I can just as easily dismiss your statements and we can just be friends? That would be nice!

Malcolm wrote:

The meat industry as a whole is opposed to the grassfed meat producers.

It is a fact that cows should not eat corn. The article you posted asserts the opposite, i.e. that cows should be fed corn in order to increase marbling of meat. This is a standard meat industry position.

The health issue for humans is antibiotics used by the standard meat industry and so on. There are many other issues as well.

As yes, we never were not friends.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

pemachophel said:

Breach of copyright is most definitely "taking what is not given freely."

dzogchungpa said:

The oracle has spoken!

However, not everyone agrees with you: In this paper, I examine the modern concepts of

intellectual property and account for their significance in monastic law and culture of early Buddhism. As a result, I have come to the following conclusions: (1) the infringement of copyrights, patents, and trademarks does not amount to theft as far as Theravādin Vinaya is concerned ...

See: <http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/2012/10/04/intellectual-property-in-early-buddhism/>

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently the author does not believe his own paper:

Copyright Notice: Digital copies of this work may be made and distributed provided no change is made and no alteration is made to the content. Re-production in any other format, with the exception of a single copy for pri-vate study, requires the written permission of the author.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Christ! I didn't tell you anything.... All I said was In order for your statement to have weight, you need to prove that it's true. Simply linking to the college website does not provide that proof...

Malcolm wrote:

Smoke --> fire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 8:59 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Oh Christ — Michael Pollan's point of view is that one's diet should be primarily plant based.

On the other hand, he also supports locally sourced, grass-fed operations of the kind run by Joel Salatin.

seeker242 said:

I'm aware of both of those things, but that still does not change the fact that just dismissing it as "industry sponsored science"

Malcolm wrote:
Just look here:

<http://animalscience.psu.edu/extension/meat>

This is the department and program where Dr. John Comerford works. Still want to tell me this not industry sponsored science?

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 8:26 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
"The reality is there is no evidence whatsoever that grass-fed beef has any advantage for safety, human health, or impact on the environment than grain-fed beef."
This is just industry sponsored "science". You should read Michael Pollen and so on.

seeker242 said:
"Michael Pollen is just grass fed industry marketing manifesting itself."

Now you see, that statement doesn't carry much weight without any actual evidence to back it up. The problem is, with that statement, I have provided just as much evidence as you have. That is really not good enough for an actual debate. You should read Richard Oppenlander, and others, where they debunk the myths perpetuated by Michael Pollan. Just dismissing it as "industry sponsored science" and leaving it at that, is very convenient way to not even address the arguments being made.

Malcolm wrote:
Oh Christ — Michael Pollan's point of view is that one's diet should be primarily plant based.

On the other hand, he also supports locally sourced, grass-fed operations of the kind run by Joel Salatin.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:57 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:

invisiblediamond said:

If I'm right then we might have to rework that theory. Even Kashmiri, some speak dialects which are more similar to Persian. Like Burushaski.

Malcolm wrote:

It is well established that Oḍḍiyāna was well within the Indo-cultural sphere. We have many reports of Chinese pilgrims going through it and so on.

As far as Burushaki goes:

Although Burushaski has been compared to almost any language on earth, no fully convincing relationships have yet been established.

<http://dickgrune.com/NatLang/Summaries/Burushaski.pdf>

While this document claims that no written Burushaki language exists, it is claimed that Nubchen translated the Anuyoga tantras from this language, and in fact Burushaki words do exist in the Anuyoga tantras.

But there is no relationship here with Persian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Do you think that the current demand of meat can be met strictly by using only pasture raised, strictly grass fed beef and dairy? Apparently 6% of beef is grass fed right now. In order to meet the current demand, you would have to increase grass fed production by more than 15 times the current level. What would be the effects of that?

Malcolm wrote:

Massive grassland restoration, for one thing, properly done.

You should look into the farming methods of Joel Salatin.

seeker242 said:

"The reality is there is no evidence whatsoever that grass-fed beef has any advantage for safety, human health, or impact on the environment than grain-fed beef."

Malcolm wrote:

This is just industry sponsored "science". You should read Michael Pollen and so on.

seeker242 said:

Personally, I don't think it's all that simple. Especially when you take into account the grass fed information above, the health effects of high meat consumption on one's body and the ethical ramifications of an industry whose sole intention it is to kill sentient beings. The whole entire meat industry, grass fed or not, has one sole intention, to kill sentient beings and sell their body parts. The whole entire industry is ethically tainted by a slaughterhouse.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not everyone shares the notion that killing animals, birds, and fish for food is morally wrong. Since they don't and are not likely too (ever), it is probably better for everyone to move people away from truly destructive practices presently found in the food production system.

seeker242 said:

That is how it's currently done but it doesn't need to be done that way IMO. The waste treatment plants in the USA that are currently and successfully using treated human waste for good fertilizer, I think is evidence that it can be done another way.

Malcolm wrote:

Because of all the crap we humans put in our bodies, I would be very skeptical of this at the present time. If human waste can be properly filtered and purified, then no problem.

Bottom line -- as long as animals are going to be killed for food (and they will, forever), it is better to move the industry to healthier standards for ourselves and the environments. You may not believe that organically raised beef, chicken and pork is better for people and the environment, but it is. It is a very simple reality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

michaelb said:

Garab Dorje, on the other hand, was Persian.

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje was from Oḍḍiyāna.

invisiblediamond said:

That far North, the people were all Aryan sharing culture up to the Pamirs.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, Oḍḍiyāna was fully within the Indian cultural sphere, not the Persian

cultural sphere.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It's not synchronic it's aim is to describe Kshnoom, the esotericism of Z. I don't think the Greek and Manichean elements are in there.

Malcolm wrote:

Synchronic means that its ideas are not parsed out in terms of when they arose.

That text has a lot of strange writing which may very well be a modern Parsee mysticism, but I do not think it is very old.

invisiblediamond said:

Yes. But I have to assume the Parsees did what their site says they did, which is go to India to do one thing, preserve the true Z-ism. Including, not mix racially. I'll agree this isn't a smoking gun. But just the fact that stuff is in there is amazing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is interesting.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

It's not synchronic it's aim is to describe Kshnoom, the esotericism of Z. I don't think the Greek and Manichean elements are in there.

Malcolm wrote:

Synchronic means that its ideas are not parsed out in terms of when they arose.

That text has a lot of strange writing which may very well be a modern Parsee mysticism, but I do not think it is very old.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

michaelb said:

Garab Dorje, on the other hand, was Persian.

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje was from Oḍḍiyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Simon E. said:

Dzogchen was not originally Bon OR Buddhist...it represents the essence of both and precedes both.

Either are adequate to provide a portal to it.

invisiblediamond said:

That's because it was Zoroastrian.

Malcolm wrote:

No. I am certainly open to the idea that Dzogchen teachings as well as Tantric teachings in India may have been influenced by Zoroastrian and Manichean concepts, but the link you provide seems to be a Pharsee document which is synchronic, i.e., it does not parse ancient Zoroastrianism from later Greek and Manichaean ideas. This is a more clear presentation:

<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/elements>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Mouse Soldier said:

The copyright law doesn't have to go anywhere for it to become archaic. They'll simply artificially create other industries in order for us to circumvent them.

Malcolm wrote:

Usually what happens is that when young people like you begin to develop a life, your attitudes change drastically depending on what you have at stake.

When your livelihood seems threatened by people who don't respect your rights, I am quite sure you will be the first one in court.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Qing Tian said:

Futerko wrote: Let's say that corporations claim ownership of the air. Are you still going to insist on legality, or will you challenge the validity of the law?

Really? I was talking about a product that has been created for the purpose of sale and you are talking about claiming ownership of something that is freely available to start with.

futerko said:

Tell that to the native populations of colonized lands.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, while I do not happen to agree with it, the notion of natural right of ownership is, in European law since Locke, superseded by the principle that the right to a resource belongs to that person who can best utilize it. John Winthrop writes in 1629, an attitude in whole derived from Locke:

That which lies common, and has never been replenished or subdued, is free to any that possess and improve it; for God hath given to the sons of men a double right to the earth — there is a natural right and a civil right. The first right was natural when men held the earth in common, every man sowing and feeding where he pleased. Then as men and their cattle increased, they appropriated certain parcels of ground by enclosing and peculiar cultivation, and this in time got them a civil right — such is the right which Ephron the Hittite had in the field of Mackpelah, wherein Abraham could not bury a dead corpse without leave, though for the out parts of the country he dwelt upon them and took the fruit of them at his pleasure. The like did Jacob, who fed his cattle as boldly in Hamor's land (for he is said to be Lord of the country) and in other places where he came, as the native inhabitants themselves. And in those times and places, that men accounted nothing their own but that which they had appropriated by their own industry, appears plainly by this — that Abimileck's servants in their own country, when they oft contended with Isaac's servants about wells which they had dug, yet never strove for the land wherein they were. So like between Jacob and Laban, he would not take a goat of Laban's without special contract, but he makes no bargain with them for the land where they fed, and it is very probable that, had the land not been as free for Jacob as for Laban, that covetous wretch would have made his advantage of it, and would have upbraided Jacob with it as he did with his cattle. As for the natives in New England, they enclose no land, neither have they any settled habitation, nor any tame cattle to improve the land by, and so have no other but a natural right to those countries. So if we leave them sufficient for their own use, we may lawfully take the rest, there being more than enough for them and for us.

But we all know how this ended...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: "Do not befriend the foolish"

Content:

Lindama said:

what is the context of this... could it also be talking about our own foolish parts? are we above it... and, what about family. Perhaps it is saying do not subscribe to foolishness in others.

old zen master talking to himself:

master, master... are you awake?

yes! yes!

don't be fooled by others

Malcolm wrote:

It is from the Bodhicarya-avatara. It means do not be familiar with immature people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Western world and buddhist life

Content:

pensum said:

Q: To many laypeople in the dharma today, the purity and uncompromising nature of your views will seem like a luxury, even an indulgence.

A: Many people seem to be all but overwhelmed by their jobs and their lives. To support themselves and their families there seems to be no choice but to get up each day and go to work. There is a certain kind of circularity here. People want to engage with teachings that point out that craving and clinging are root causes of stress. Yet people don't want to let go of patterns of being and consuming that fuel craving and clinging.

We have to ask honestly whether the people you describe really want to be transformed or whether they are simply looking for ways to reduce their stress. What do they want?

From an interview with Mu Soeng <http://www.tricycle.com/interview/dharma-sale>

Malcolm wrote:

Reduce stress first.

Starve craving and clinging second.

You cannot let go of patterns of craving and clinging if you are stressed out.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs apply here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The can't claim ownership, they license bandwidth.

futerko said:

Of course, all you need to do is find a way to put a fence around it in order to claim distribution rights.

Malcolm wrote:

If you broadcast on someone else's bandwidth, you will be shutdown pretty fast.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Qing Tian said:

I realise that my position is unpopular, but I have yet to hear a convincing argument to support piracy.

Mouse Soldier said:

I felt that my post, and the comparison to the invention of the printing press was somewhat apt. File sharing is a simple fact of life these days because it's so easy and the copyright laws concerning intellectual property are quickly becoming archaic. The printing press put many scribes out of work, but it brought with it wonderful new industries and opportunity for human development. In this analogy the printing press is the internet, and the scribes are corporations wanting to hold onto the old methods of doing things because the modern applications of the internet put their business model in jeopardy.

The biggest difference is that unlike the scribes, these corporations have a lot of money and power that they use to hold back the world from change, in the forms of copyright law and DRM technologies. Progress is inevitable, but they're certainly capable of gumming up the process some and continuing to profit from their arguably artificial means of remaining relevant. For now.

Malcolm wrote:

You are missing one tiny little fact in your analysis. Copyright laws are not going anywhere, since they are based on extremely ancient and deeply embedded principles of property rights that can be traced directly back to Roman Law:

...Roman law regulated the legal protection of property and the equality of legal

subjects and their wills, and because it prescribed the possibility that the legal subjects could dispose their property through testament.

In US law, specifically copyright law is intended to ensure:

"...the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8, US Constitution.

Anything I write, be it code, music, etc., is protected by this law. This is why in the US, at any rate, it is quite illegal to download software that has been broken, DRM encryptions and so on. It is theft under US Law. Of course, if an author/artist wishes to relinquish this right, they may do so, hence Copyleft, and other alternate intellectual property schemes have been introduced.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We are talking about whether or not it is theft/receiving stolen goods to download a pirated copy of say Logic Pro.

dzogchungpa said:

I am not saying it is right to download a pirated copy of Logic Pro. However, in all seriousness, I'm not sure it is either theft or receiving stolen goods. It might be illegal, but I don't think it is an example of either of those, legally speaking, and I don't think it's an example of either of those in the ordinary sense of those words either. Buddhists can condemn that kind of thing, but I don't think there's any point in misusing language in our eagerness to do so.

Johnny Dangerous said:

The right thing to do is download Audacity instead heh, and circumvent the whole ethical issue, as well as supporting people who want to make recording software for free, instead of people who ask \$200 for abig box of cute bells and whistles;)

Malcolm wrote:

Audacity does not have all the bells and whistles. Its great for what it does. But Logic Pro infinitely more useful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Qing Tian said:

Futerko, I felt that the claim was implicit.

As for... I personally find your relationship to rule-governed behaviour quite rigid
That's a fair point, although it is also an assumption. If people diligently followed the 8FP then I guess the 'rules' would not be required... but they don't and so they are.
Discarding rules in a cavalier fashion without recourse to an acceptable ethical framework is likely to result in further suffering.

I realise that my position is unpopular, but I have yet to hear a convincing argument to support piracy.

You going to provide one?

futerko said:

Let's say that corporations claim ownership of the air. Are you still going to insist on legality, or will you challenge the validity of the law?

Malcolm wrote:

The can't claim ownership, they license bandwidth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Sure, and also, important to the Kagyu Stew, he was a Kadampa Monk as well.....and then he met Milarepa.

smcj said:

And that Milarepa tried the Nyingma Dzogchen/sudden path too. It didn't work for him, so that's when he went to go find Marpa.

Malcolm wrote:

It would have, he just didn't understand the instructions and did not meditate. So Rongton sent him to Marpa.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: "Do not befriend the foolish"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

གསུངས་ is both the imperative as well as the past. Tibetan does not have a "perfect past" It has only three conjugations of verbs, past/future; present/infinitive and imperative. Often the imperative is morphologically the same as the past tense.

So this line could be read both ways i.e. as a command or as past tense.

Generally, for bshes pa to be a verb, it usually requires the auxiliary "byed pa". Here the auxiliary [bya/byed] is elided, but implied.

It could also be translated completely nominally: "Do not be a friend to immature [person] at all", etc.

Depending on dialect, བྱིས་པ་ is pronounced something like "ji/chi pa"; but in Amdo, it would be "Yay pa"

kirtu said:

From Hacket, "A Tibetan Verb Lexicon": བྱིས་པ་འགའ་ཡང་བཤེས་མིན་ཞེས། །དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པ་ནྟམས་ཀྱིས་གསུངས།: All the Tathagatas have said "Do not befriend the foolish".

Why does Hacket insert "have" to change གསུངས། to the perfect past? Is there actually a perfect past in Tibetan as opposed to just a past tense (perfect past being things that are actually completed and often a while ago)?

How does this get parsed out: བྱིས་པ་འགའ་ཡང་བཤེས་མིན་ཞེས།:

བྱིས་པ་: foolish beings

འགའ་ཡང་: at all, whatsoever

བཤེས་: friend

མིན་: not

ཞེས།: particle indicating quote

"Do not become friends at all with foolish beings" - ? Is བཤེས་ actually a verb? Otherwise what is the logic behind this construction?

Also how is བྱིས་པ་ pronounced? be pa (bay pa) ?

Thanks!

Kirt

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

futerko said:

Well, going back a few years, the Sex Pistols weren't too impressed with EMI...

Malcolm wrote:

The Great Rock and Roll Swindle anyone?

<http://sabotagetimes.com/reportage/the-untold-story-behind-the-great-rock-n-roll-swindle/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

futerko said:

Debating the technicalities of whether this is theft, or receiving stolen property, or not, strikes me as rather misplaced.

On the one side - of course corporate property laws designed for maximum profit and establishing a monopoly are suspect and bordering on the exploitative.

On the other - the demand for a steady stream of high production entertainment is also unhealthy for the individual and plays right into the hands of those corporations.

Clearly it is preferable for those individuals to break the cycle of addiction, however it is also desirable to break the corporate stranglehold on artistic content.

Malcolm wrote:

Ahem....it is generally the artists themselves that want these protections....

In any case we are not really taking about Metallica.

We are talking about whether or not it is theft/receiving stolen goods to download a pirated copy of say Logic Pro.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

If you say it's a question of degree, OK,

Malcolm wrote:

It is a question of law.

dzogchungpa said:

If you mean that it is stealing or pirating because the law forbids it, maybe that makes sense in a certain way, but I am addressing the "depriving of profits" = "stealing/pirating" argument, i.e the idea that if someone is "deprived" of profits than an act of stealing or piracy, according to the ordinary understanding of those terms, has taken place. If one accepts that idea, then honestly I believe one would have to admit that libraries are engaged in pirating books as well. For example, I have access through my local library to the link+ system: <http://csul.iii.com/screens/members.html>. I used to buy many books, both used and new, but when I started to use that system, I basically didn't need to anymore, and so I more or less stopped buying books. I doubt authors, publishers and bookstores benefited as a result. Does that mean someone stole or pirated something? It seems that some here would say yes, but I don't think so.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out to you -- libraries pay a higher price for books in general than you do personally.

Also, one can loan and borrow books on Amazon [for a yearly surcharge which is part of Amazon Prime -- clearly some portion of this is being paid to the publishers].

Authors benefit because they their books are being read (they are paid a higher royalty for library sales), Libraries benefit because they can purchase more books. Bookstores do not benefit from libraries of course, but that is the market for you. Libraries and bookstores are in competition which is why B&N etc., permit you to browse and read books in their place, a deferred sales strategy, if you will.

All of this is off-topic however.

In any case: it is clear that downloading software that has been broken into by defeating its cryptographic protections is theft. Those protections are placed on software sold to companies and individuals. You or the company is issued a license to use that software. If you break the encryption or give away the key to your unique copy of that software to others, you are guilty of theft. If you download pirated software, you are not guilty of stealing exactly, you are guilty of receiving stolen goods, technically. But receipt of stolen goods is still "taking what has not been given".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

If you say it's a question of degree, OK,

Malcolm wrote:
It is a question of law.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 1:38 AM
Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
Are libraries pirating books?

Malcolm wrote:
The answer is no. Publishers price books for libraries at a much higher price than for individuals exactly for this purpose. In fact, some publishers, like Brill, price their speciality books primarily for libraries, which is why they are so expensive.

dzogchungpa said:
OK, but let's say I give the library a book, having paid the regular price for it. Then the library would be pirating it by lending it out and thereby depriving the publisher of profits?

Malcolm wrote:
Not at all. The publisher would only be deprived of profits if you took the book out of the library copied it, and gave it to your friends. This is why most large copy shops in the US will not copy books.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 1:18 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
michaelb said:
Malcolm, I thought maize had been a staple in S.American diet for a very long time, but the widespread use of modified maize syrup was linked to global rise in obesity.

Malcolm wrote:
Domestic cattle, pigs and chicken were only introduced to the Americans in the 16th century by the Spanish. The primary domesticated meat animals of the Americas were dogs and turkeys until this time.

Maize is a crop developed by humans in Central Mexico some believe around 4600 years ago, though others assert it is as old as 10,000 -- it is not clear.

Maize is the only crop we grow that is entirely dependent on human intervention for its propagation. Maize never existed in the wild, unlike wheat, rye, oats, barely and so on. Plant geneticists are still not entirely certain exactly which plants were hybridized to create Maize. The main plant that people think maize comes from is a wild grass called Teosinte.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Jainarayan said:

There are technological safeguards against photocopying and digital copying. If they are not employed by the publisher or distributor, that says to me they are well aware that the materials will be copied. One can go into a Barnes & Noble, get a Starbucks coffee, sit and read a book cover to cover, put it back on the shelf and leave. This is actually encouraged by B&N. B&N has paid for the book, and you are reading it using their facilities without paying for anything other than coffee and maybe a brownie. Is that stealing? B&N doesn't think so. The author and publisher got their share. Now, to make money by selling the copied materials is preceptually wrong as well as illegal, imo.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, Amazon has forced B&N into near bankruptcy. And libraries around the US are shuttering their doors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Are libraries pirating books?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is no. Publishers price books for libraries at a much higher price than for individuals exactly for this purpose. In fact, some publishers, like Brill, price their speciality books primarily for libraries, which is why they are so expensive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I am not making it out to be innocent. It is clearly breaking the law. What it is not doing is breaking the 2nd precept.

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu established the judicial character of the second precept as follows:

To take a thing that does not have an owner is to take what is not given by the ruler of a country.

So, for Canadians, downloading music and tv shows is not a violation of the second precept since it is permitted by their government, whereas for Americans it is, since this kind of activity is prohibited by my government.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

michaelb said:

Does anyone just feed livestock grass and hay? Do pigs and chickens eat grass? I thought, due to lack of space and the weather, even 'organic' cattle are kept inside for at least a few months a year and fed soya, bonemeal and stuff made from chicken feathers. Non-organic livestock are fed GM soya, of course as well as a bunch of other odd stuff (chickens are already cannibals, for example.)

Malcolm wrote:

Chicken meat and pork was traditionally more expensive than beef because these animals require grain in general as part of their diet. Now they are less expensive than beef pound for pound in the US because corn is subsidized by the US Government.

Not only that, but in general, meat of all kinds was traditionally also a seasonal food. In northern climes, animals would not be slaughtered until the autumn. People did not eat steaks year round. It is only with the advent of refrigeration that the modern industrial economy of meat is even possible.

For most of the year, what meat was in people's diets was usually sausage and dried meats in general, added in some portions to meals. Arguably, people were healthier as a result.

From a dietary point of view meat and dairy combined is a very building diet. It is no mistake that individuals in meat/dairy eating societies are larger, heavier and stronger (as well as more aggressive) than those in societies who eat little or no meat.

In the organic "local" beef industry, there are two kinds of programs, grass finished and grain finished. Grain finished beef has more fat. However, maize is a relatively recent crop in human history, and cattle never evolved to properly digest it. It is very harmful for them. The reason so much antibiotic is used in grain-fed feedlot beef, as well as grain-fed dairy cattle, is that corn causes acidosis in cattle which in turn leaves them open to infection, and so on.

Also, there is however another problem (similar to the biofuel craze) -- the craze for grass fed beef has led to clearing rainforest in South America and elsewhere, which is why it is important for an environmentally conscientious omnivore to only eat locally sourced meat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 10th, 2013 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can't even own physical things. The idea of owning physical things is also a metaphor. In fact, the criteria for stealing is based on another's sense of property, not our own.

Karma Dorje said:

If I observe your car parked in your driveway and create a replica of it, you are saying that I stole your car? There is very obviously a difference between copying something and stealing it. If I steal your car, I deprive you of its use. If I copy your car, there are now more cars.

Malcolm wrote:

If I invent a car and patent it, then you copy it and then sell it, then you are stealing.

I understand that in Canada, downloading pirated material is not illegal. But it is in the US. Hence, in the US, downloading music and software online is illegal, whereas if I make a cd of music I own and give it to someone, it is not illegal. Such is the nature of the contradictory laws.

However, in general, since a piece of code is regarded as property, under US law, downloading pirated versions of Acrobat (where the software key has been compromised) is illegal. Giving away that key to others is also illegal, as you know.

DMR also is used for the same reason. You have to break the DMR to pirate Itunes music. Of course, if you buy the CD, copy it and give those copies to your friends, this is not illegal. If you upload that copy to the internet, however, you will definitely be busted eventually if you do it a lot, and are a US citizen.

But in general the second precept refers to taking what is not given. This also applies to a \$50 bill lying on the ground. If you wish to be very diligent, it is better you do not pick it up. The same applies to digital media. As I said, there are certain Academic books that I will download from Scribd (some of which I have bought in the past for \$\$\$) to further my research. But in general, I have a policy of not using that which I have not paid for, whether it is software, music, tv, movies, etc.

In the end it is a question of individual conscience as well as local laws. If I were Canadian, I would probably not be so reticent about downloading music and so on,

since it is not illegal in Canada to do so. I would not download pirated software however, because that has be digitally broken into in order to be distributed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But even so, this text does not really offer a clear affirmation of primordial buddhahood.

Sherab Dorje said:

The Gampopa quote clearly does. Pretty funny when you consider that Gampopa was (for the Karma Kagyu) the "founder" of the whole gradualist approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Gampopa taught what he thought was appropriate for his audience.

You must remember however that Gampopa was a Dzogchen practitioner from a young age, as he originally was a Nyingmapa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Copying and pasting data is not taking. It is copying. Sharing.

Mouse Soldier said:

It's not the data we may be "stealing", it's the money that would have been paid out had we purchased the data.

Karma Dorje said:

This makes no sense. Who is in possession of "the money that would have been paid out"? You can't steal something that someone might have in the future, only something they actually possess. All of these problem ensue from regarding a metaphor as a actuality. You can't own ideas, only physical things. If someone steals a physical book, it's theft. If someone photocopies the book, it's a copyright infringement and this has certain legal significance. Trying to intrude buddhist morality into what is simply a matter of contractual law is perverse and strange.

Malcolm wrote:

You can't even own physical things. The idea of owning physical things is also a metaphor. In fact, the criteria for stealing is based on another's sense of property, not

our own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

“By eating meat we share the responsibility of climate change, the destruction of our forests, and the poisoning of our air and water. The simple act of becoming a vegetarian will make a difference in the health of our planet.”

Yes, we do have a choice.

Malcolm wrote:

I think that Thich Nhat Hahn is making a massive oversimplification.

seeker242 said:

I think the statement is massively simple but at the same time does accurately reflect and summarize the complex situation. Modern day animal agriculture is extremely destructive to the environment.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes that is true. However, it is not true that eating meat necessarily adds to that. That really depends upon the source of the meat that one eats. Eating meat from commercial feed lots is very destructive, as opposed to pasture raised, strictly grass fed beef and dairy which does not depend on grain which is not environmentally destructive at all. If we wish to stem environmentally destructive meat, it is simple enough to change from industrially produced meat to locally produced meat. However, that also requires changing our plant consumption from industrial agriculture too. As i have pointed out many times, industrial level organic farming absolutely requires animal concentrates at levels possible only because of industrial levels of animal husbandry and slaughter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 11:59 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist ethics also recognize that one must obey the laws of whatever society one belongs to.

Indrajala said:

That's just a general idea really.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a very specific fact of buddhist ethics which as you know has commentarial support.

The sangha is capable of adjudicating only breaches of vows, but not crimes, or even civil disputes.

Taking what is not given applies to anything someone else regards as their property, including intellectual property.

For this reason, while i certainly dont pretend to be a perfect upasaka,, i never diownload pirated music or software. I admit to downloading brilll publications however, and other academic buddhist works that are priced for libraries in order to further my research. But i recognize that it is not a perfect thing to do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Does software pirating break the second precept?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Copyright laws are not covered in any pre-modern discussion of Buddhist ethics because they didn't exist.

The general understanding of theft requires that you successfully physically move something you recognize as belonging to another person without their consent.

To copy and paste data does not qualify as theft in that respect. In Buddhist ethics you cannot steal a song, because a song is not something you can deprive from another.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it does.

Buddhist ethics also recognize that one must obey the laws of whatever society one belongs to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Caz said:

Is this Rigpa the same as Clear light ? or is it a seperate entity ?

Malcolm wrote:

That "Mind of" [kyi sems] is the unmixed totally complete essence, the primal nature of

the eight consciousnesses endowed with a luminous ['od gsal] identity which inherently never wavers into any extreme at all, free from all extremes, naturally pure and unwavering in the three times.

Now then, if it is asked “Is it not impossible for such a pure primal nature to appear to the mind of a person?”, it is possible, called “vidyā” [rig pa, the knowing aspect of the mind]. The vidyā of migrating beings itself appears as the mental consciousness in terms of apprehending subjects and apprehended objects. When vidyā manifests its own primal nature, the mental consciousness manifests as self-originated wisdom, and then the pure basis of the mental consciousness (free from the root of an apprehending subject and apprehended objects) bring samsara to an end. The wisdom of one’s vidyā (without root or leaf) — naturally perfected as it all-encompassingly subsumes everything — is the true state [de kho na nyid].

-- The Sun That Illuminates the Meaning

You really ought to read that text by Tsongkhapa that I mentioned to TK fan. It is useless to quote texts to you from the Dzogchen tradition directly in some respects, but you cannot reject the writing of the founder of your own lineage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Caz said:

Malcolm

Well yes it is to the muddled minds of sentient beings it (samsara) is a very real object.

Malcolm wrote:

So you grant samsara is not real, is not established etc.?

Is that "muddle" in the minds of sentient beings real or not?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Caz said:

How can Buddhahood be Inherently accomplished when it is not manifest ? If it was Inherent as suggested then by nature it would be unchanging and hence never unmanifest yet sentient beings still experience Samsaric suffering and have to work hard to accomplish Enlightenment.

The potentiality is always present but how could Buddhahood be present in the mind of

an ordinary being ?

asunthatneversets said:

Primordial wisdom [ye shes] is originally pure [ka dag] and naturally perfected [lhun grub], all that is required is recognition. From the standpoint of wisdom the whole charade of samsāra and nirvāna is illusory and unreal.

Caz said:

If its naturally perfected why is it unmanifest ? If it is Primordial and naturally perfected why is there Samsara in the first place ?

Malcolm wrote:

Is samsara there in the first place?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I would say that Mr. Esler has a slightly anachronistic read of Nubchen. None of the text available to Nubs, AFAIK, use terms like gzhi snang and so on. In this footnote, at any rate, he is reading the man ngag sde text doctrine into the bodhicitta texts. I would say this is erroneous.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, that's interesting. Is his statement about grol-gzhi and 'khrul-gzhi accurate then? If so, would it be possible to explain how the bodhicitta texts view of gzhi differ from what he says in his footnote?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the bodhicitta texts, no distinction is made between the kun gzhi and the gzhi i.e. the all-basis and the basis.

It is true, however that in the bodicitta texts, the all-basis is both the basis of liberation and delusion depending upon whether one has received instructions or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Footnote 10 reads in part as: As such, the ground is always alpha-pure (ka-dag); it is

according to an individual's recognition or non-recognition of the ground's illumination (gzhi-srang) that it becomes, in the experience of a Buddha, the ground of liberation (grol-gzhi) and, in the experience of ordinary sentient beings, the ground of confusion. Of course I don't know if the above is in line with Malcolm's thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

I would say that Mr. Esler has a slightly anachronistic read of Nubchen. None of the text available to Nubs, AFAIK, use terms like gzhi srang and so on. In this footnote, at any rate, he is reading the man ngag sde text doctrine into the bodhicitta texts. I would say this is erroneous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

"By eating meat we share the responsibility of climate change, the destruction of our forests, and the poisoning of our air and water. The simple act of becoming a vegetarian will make a difference in the health of our planet."

Yes, we do have a choice.

Malcolm wrote:

I think that Thich Nhat Hahn is making a massive oversimplification.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Whatever turns you on dude!

How about this one?

"Meditation:

why look for freedom in a lie?

The net of illusion:

why hold it so tight?

Trust in the truth

of the precious guru's word;

Saraha says:
I've made my declaration."

or this one:

"No tantra, no mantra,
no reflection or recollection -

Hey fool! All this
is the cause of error.

Mind is unstained -
don't taint it with meditation;

you're living in bliss:
don't torment yourself."

Saraha

Malcolm wrote:
As I said, Saraha is not deluded.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Mhamudra is primordial too.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, parse it out for us then, Greg.

Maitripa states in the Mahāmudrākanakamālā:

In the same way, when not realized, samsara and nirvana are analyzed separately; when realized, samsara has always been the kāya of the great buddha.

But this is a little different.

Sherab Dorje said:
"1) To have a decisive understanding about the True Nature
Mahamudra has no causes.
Mahamudra has no conditions.
Mahamudra has no methods.
Mahamudra has no path.
Mahamudra has no result."
Gampopa The Very Essence of Mind, Mahamudra, the One sufficient Path

"6. For thousands of aeons, the sun that shines every day
has never been clouded by darkness.

Likewise, the real nature of the mind's clear light of awareness
Has never been clouded by the cycle of samsara.

12. Never leave Thatness, but don't stay in it either and don't try to represent it.
Simply vow never to leave it, and nothing will obscure the flames [of awakening].
Beyond the reactivity of the [ordinary] mind moving toward and moving away,
not trying to stay, not even trying to see it, then you will see everything there is to see!"
Tilopa Ganges Mahamudra

Malcolm wrote:

You should have cited this verse:

Practitioners of mantra, of the perfections,
of discipline, and of the sutras and so on
do not see the luminosity of mahāmudrā,
with their own texts and theories,
luminosity is not seen, obscured with such wishful thinking.

And this:

Beyond all objects of perception, the nature of the mind is clarity,
without a path to traverse, the path of Buddhahood is entered,
if one cultivates without an object of meditation, one will attain unsurpassed awakening.

But even so, this text does not really offer a clear affirmation of primordial buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

I do have a bias towards not abusing and not mass killing of billions of living beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you need to understand that all agriculture will result in the same thing (i.e. the mass killing of billions of living beings).

Factually speaking, we have a choice -- we can, as we have for the past ten millenia, continue to rely on animal inputs for fertilizing agriculture (which has a corollary, we cannot support or sustain a large population of animals that are not producing inputs into that system, hence the need for slaughter); or we can continue to poison the planet by reliance on petrochemicals (which are increasingly more difficult and dangerous for our environment to extract).

The choice is yours. We either have a living biosystem where living beings (plants and animals) feed on other living beings (plants and animals), or we have a poisoned planet where everything dies apart from humans and those plants and animals we choose to preserve.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Evolution of Pure Land

Content:

zamotcr said:

Right now, undersating and seeying this evolution of concepts and ideas, give me a broader view of Mahayana buddhism, very different from Theravada, and that is, Mahayana is a living religion, evolving with new views and interpretations

kirtu said:

So is Theravada. There used to be 16 or 17 or so Sravaka lineages and now there is only one. And few people know the history of Theravada going back several centuries, for example. But there are still many different Mahayana lineages. We are seeing changes in Mahayana over centuries up to 2.5 millenia. The changes that we are seeing in Theravada are not so obvious and are much more incremental because we are seeing them over a period of decades to 150 years (so the lifespans of 4-5 masters max).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

There are three in fact: Theravada, Mulasarvastivada and Dharmaguptaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 9th, 2013 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Evolution of Pure Land

Content:

zamotcr said:

I have been studying the Lotus Sutra this days and I found the concept of Pure Land to be different from the general accepted view. It's like the Pure Land concept and theory (or comoslogy, perhaps) has evolved from it's inception.

Malcolm wrote:

Chances are, the archeological foundation for the concept of the "western paradise" was <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pasargadae> as well as https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persian_Gardens

See this interesting paper as well:

http://www.sino-platonic.org/complete/spp076_buddhism_paradise.pdf

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

I've got this really strong feeling that Dzogchen is a restatement of Zoroastrianism, transmuting the impure matter into light.?

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are confusing Zoroastrianism with Manichaeism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

What are you talking about Malcolm? Your teacher is a recognised tulku from a family (lineage) of tulkus and nobility to boot. His son (and likely heir) is a tulku that was enthroned and "given" a monastery (seat) too. He even wore a funny hat and rode a pony to prove it. Sure, neither of them hold monks vows but they are 100% part of the tulku deal.

Malcolm wrote:

It is true that both Norbu Rinpoche and his son are tulkus. But Dzogchen Community itself has no affiliation with any monastic seat. It does not invite teachers from any specified monastic lineage. It does not feed students to any monastic establishment.

While it may be the case that both ChNN and Yeshe Namkhai are nominally abbots (via reincarnation) of two Tibetan monasteries (In the case of the former a Drukpa Kagyu Monastery in Central Tibet; in the case of the latter, a Sakya monastery near Dege), very little fund raising is ever done to support them in the DC. They are supported by Tibetans, not westerners.

As I said, the DC is independent, and is not grounded in the Tibetan monastic establishment. While ChNN has thousands of "students" in Tibet, he has focused most of his attention teaching in the West. He has spent all of his adult life in the West (Happy Bday Rinpoche!!!!), moving to Rome when he was 23 or so (in 1961).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Some people just don't seem to understand that it's about the animals...

Abuse like this is commonplace...It has been found... every...single...time...they have done undercover investigations. It's the rule, not the exception. Is this ethical? How can anyone willingly be involved with this?

Malcolm wrote:

Right. It is about the animals.

But why do you assume that everyone who consumes meat lacks awareness of the horrors of industrial animal husbandry?

Why do you assume it is impossible to make other economic choices about what kind of meat is to be consumed?

And why do you assume you have to only solution to their suffering, even so?

Actually, if one consumes meat it does not add to suffering; refraining from eating meat contributes nothing to the reduction of suffering,

You may think you are reducing suffering of animals by not consuming their flesh, but it isn't so. Thinking that it is so means you understood nothing about the nature of suffering.

If you don't want to eat meat, for whatever reason, that is fine. But you should understand that your choices are not objective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We have three kinds of proposed buddhahood in various schools:

gradual -- ala sutra and most Vajrayāna

sudden/non-gradual -- Mahāmudra/Chan

primordial -- Dzogchen.

Punya said:

Sorry to backtrack but why use the word primordial which in everyday english seems to have a time connotation? What is the tibetan word and is there an alternative translation?

dzogchungpa said:

I'm sure Malcolm will respond, but I think it is most likely 'gdod ma', or possibly 'thog ma'.

Malcolm wrote:

"ye nas"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

i dont know if the story of milarepa is true or not, but if you know its not, where does your sources come from in this matter?

Malcolm wrote:

One of the difficult things in studying pre-modern cultures is sorting out myth, legend and outright fabrication from history.

As it stands, the biography of Milarepa penned by Tsang Nyon Heruka is mostly religious fiction. If you want to know the details of the evolution of Milarepa's biography and its shifting set of details between the 12th century and the 16th, consult Peter Alan Robert's book, *The Biographies of Rechungpa: The Evolution of a Tibetan Hagiography*

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Pero said:

...this would be nothing other than new-age nonsense.

Indrajala said:

Not really. In most forms of Buddhism you can practice anything you read in scripture without permission or initiation of any sort. Vajrayāna is the exception.

Malcolm wrote:

And of course, the common misunderstanding of empowerments/initiations is that they are merely there to allow you to practice something. In fact empowerment is the primary method of liberation in Vajrayāna. It is only if you do not wake up from the empowerment itself that you are given a sadhana to practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Okay...while we're on this subject, I want to ask why Buddhists rely on Dzogchen when it was not taught by Buddha Shakyamuni or Buddha Vajradhara. I'm prepared to be corrected, but to my knowledge Buddha never taught about Rigpa or Dzogchen, or about primordial Buddhahood. There are the Buddhanature teachings in the Third turning of the Wheel of Dharma but these are not definitive, just interpretative. Can anyone explain the definitive source of the Dzogchen teachings and show that they are Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

For Gelugpas, Dzogchen was validated by Tsongkhapa in a text that appears in the first volume of the Zhol edition of Tsongkhapa's collected works called the zhu lan sman mchog bdud rtsi'i phreng ba (blo bzang grags pa'i dpal. "zhu lan sman mchog bdud rtsi'i phreng ba." In gsung 'bum/_tsong kha pa (zhol). TBRC W635. 1: 295 - 320. new delhi, india: mongolian lama guru deva, 1978-1979.
[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O2CZ7209%7CO2CZ72092CZ7221\\$W635](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O2CZ7209%7CO2CZ72092CZ7221$W635))

The English translation can be found in the LTWA publication, Life and Teachings of Tsongkhapa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Pero said:

IMO, the tulku system is not an actual part of my "religion". It is more like some kind of religious political system. I don't doubt there are some true tulkus but I personally couldn't care less who recognized who, it means absolutely nothing.

Indrajala said:

Yet much of your lineage leadership is presumably decided by men who were given the tulku title at birth, as decided by a group of people you have few connections with. Many exclusive resources are put into tulkus which, perhaps, part of your contributions go to.

But then I guess if you don't pay into the system, it isn't an issue. Also, it won't matter if your tradition in your home country is politically and financially autonomous.

Malcolm wrote:

Pero and i do not belong to a school grounded in the traditional tibetan monastic system. So it is not really an issue for us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Indrajala said:

As non-Tibetan Tibetan Buddhists, do you ever feel the tulku system ethnically excludes you? I know there are western tulkus, but not really so many (several of them don't have good track records to date too).

At best you can really just watch from the sidelines as the top Tibetan clerics make their judgements and write letters announcing a new tulku has been found. The whole administrative process and top brass are dominated by a small echelon of Tibetan men. As patrons and practitioners, doesn't it ever feel like you're being excluded from your own religion which you are supposed to be part and parcel of?

I don't ask that to be provocative. I'm actually interested in knowing what people think. You pay for and practice religious traditions which don't really embrace you or your kind into the administrative fold (at least not yet, but it doesn't seem like it will happen anytime soon).

Malcolm wrote:

No more exclusive than the catholic church...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 9:02 AM

Title: Is the tulku system too exclusive?

Content:

Pero said:

IMO, the tulku system is not an actual part of my "religion". It is more like some kind of religious political system. I don't doubt there are some true tulkus but I personally couldn't care less who recognized who, it means absolutely nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

Seconded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 8:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

but if one rejects meditation in atiyoga, how will it not become endowed with accepting and rejecting?

Does this mean that if a dzogchen practitioner decides on the basis of the preceding part of the quotation that there is no meditation to be done, he or she will stray into accepting and rejecting?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

When a student meets a sudden buddhahood teacher, and is introduced, it is different than when a student means a primordial buddhahood teacher and is introduced, because...

Malcolm wrote:

Because the former still thinks there is something missing.

Sherab said:

There is something missing. That something is realization. Other than that, nothing else is missing.

Malcolm wrote:

What is missing is the following confidence:

The realization of the truth is that since there is nothing to realize, there is no meditation — one should have confidence that there is nothing to mediate upon. If there is something to realize, for what reason do an object to realize and a realizer not occur? All the teachings of meditation taught in the intimate instructions merely demonstrate meditating on one's vidyā without one moving because there is no inside and outside, but if one rejects meditation in atiyoga, how will it not become endowed with accepting and rejecting?

-- The Sun of the Heart

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Simon E. said:

Or in extreme cases posting material that suggests that meat eaters are hell bound.

I think seeker242's " yes ! " in the context of that thread shows clearly that he thinks that the text in question indicates that HHDL is going to hell because he is a meat eater. T

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when your path requires three incalculable eons, you have to be a bit more careful, Simon.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 5:44 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist ethics at a national level
Content:

kirtu said:
Legal redress in the US is severely limited.

Malcolm wrote:
That is an over-generalization.

In Yankeedom and the Left Coast, things are easier.

You live on the border of the Deep South. Your perspective about the US is heavily colored by the fact that you on the edge the cultural sphere of one of the most brutal, aggressive and repressive societies every known, founded at Charleston by slavers from Barbados.

You should read American Nations (Woodard, 2011) -- it provides the answer for why I generally disagree with your characterizations of the "US". You live in a "US" I never have. I live in a "US" that you don't.

(Ironically, on another note, Obamacare was indirectly hatched by the Heritage Foundation...which is why it is such a cluster...)

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 5:13 AM
Title: Re: Buddhist ethics at a national level
Content:
Indrajala said:
Pornography, prostitution and so on...

Malcolm wrote:
Sex work is only a vice under patriarchy.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 5:08 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:

invisiblediamond said:

When a student meets a sudden buddhahood teacher, and is introduced, it is different than when a student meets a primordial buddhahood teacher and is introduced, because...

Malcolm wrote:

Because the former still thinks there is something missing.

Luke said:

Then what is the difference between a Dzogchen master and an ordinary person who is completely content with ordinary life, who could care less about religion, and who doesn't feel that "there is something missing" either?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing. Buddhas and sentient beings are nondual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

That's quite a smoke screen but it seems to me to be a long winded way of just saying "No!".

Malcolm wrote:

Nondual great bliss is the conduct of all sentient beings, demonstrated as a mistaken path by the deluded.

-- Innermost Great Potentiality

Enjoy your buddhahood while you still can, Greg.

M

Sherab Dorje said:

Fat chance, I'm too busy enjoying my ignorance!

"Existence is Nirvana -

indeed, they can't be
considered apart;

they lack a single nature -

to me they are

completely stainless."

Saraha

Malcolm wrote:
Saraha was not deluded, indeed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:47 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Mhamudra is primordial too.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, parse it out for us then, Greg.

Maitripa states in the Mahāmudrākanakamālā:

In the same way, when not realized, samsara and nirvana are analyzed separately; when realized, samsara has always been the kāya of the great buddha.

But this is a little different.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:35 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
invisiblediamond said:
So are we primordial samyaksambuddhas then? The Four Visions are not traversed in time?

Malcolm wrote:
All qualities of buddhahood are complete in all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:31 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?
Content:
invisiblediamond said:
When a student meets a sudden buddhahood teacher, and is introduced, it is different than when a student meets a primordial buddhahood teacher and is introduced, because...

Malcolm wrote:
Because the former still thinks there is something missing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, it is not correct to term Dzogchen "nongradual".

dzogchungpa said:

It is beyond cause and effect though, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is why the term "nongradual" is not very accurate when used to described Dzogchen. We have three kinds of proposed buddhahood in various schools:

gradual -- ala sutra and most Vajrayāna
sudden/non-gradual -- Mahāmudra/Chan
primordial -- Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for postration.

Content:

smcj said:

Start doing them before the retreat. On a physical level it is like getting into shape for any physical exercise. You do NOT want to just start doing hundreds a day! You will be so sore you'll have to stop, and your other meditations will suffer as well. Get into shape before the retreat!

The important thing about prostration boards (if your teacher will allow them) is that your feet are 3"-4" below where your knees hit. That makes pushing up MUCH easier, which saves your stomach muscles. Also get a soft pad and tape it down where your knees hit. A couple pieces of spare carpet will do for hand sliders. I use a swimmers lap counter instead of a hand male to count. It fits on your finger and isn't sliding around, which can be annoying.

Good luck!

Malcolm wrote:

There are the three main injuries that turn prostrations into a harmful and injurious activity as opposed to what they are supposed to be: a yoga for loosening the main channels of the body. These are: Injuries to the cervical spine, the lumbar spine, and the knees.

To prevent injuries to the neck, lower your head as you bend down.

To prevent injuries to the small of your back as well as your knees, you should never allow your knees to "hit", nor should you slide out from a kneeling position. You should slide out to the up position of a pushup, and then lower your body in such a way that you do not "hit" your knees (which causes many practitioners to have lifelong knee injuries) nor strain the small of your back.

When you rise, keep your head down while you slide back onto your knees, and then when you stand, keep your head down until you are full standing, rolling up from the base of the spine.

Despite the masochism with which many people approach prostrations, prostrations, and indeed no spiritual activity, should be a cause for harming the body, especially if you are a Vajrayāna practitioner, since knowingly harming the body is violation of root samayas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

oushi said:

Both gradual and nongradual implies a doer.

Since doer is an illusion, he never existed as something fixed.

Realization still implies a person. Liberation is always free from fixation.

Thus, one can realize gradually or nongradually that liberation was always present.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, it is not correct to term Dzogchen "nongradual".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Anyway, as it has been said countless times this concept of non-gradual seems to completely disregard the previous infinite lives one has lived to arrive at liberation "here and now".

Malcolm wrote:

It is irrelevant:

There is no place for birth and transmigration
in the experiential field of Samantabhadra.

Since the twelve limbs of cause and condition

are an explanation for the critical and the analytical,
in this way, the wise should understand this
as a mere doorway for the deluded.

-- Soaring Great Garuda

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

That's quite a smoke screen but it seems to me to be a long winded way of just saying "No!".

Malcolm wrote:

Nondual great bliss is the conduct of all sentient beings,
demonstrated as a mistaken path by the deluded.

-- Innermost Great Potentiality

Enjoy your buddhahood while you still can, Greg.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab said:

If the quotation is to true, then it is wrong to say that there is a buddhahood that is already present and always has been.

Malcolm wrote:

"[T]o identify a prong of gold, having immersed gold in a pan of water and then boiled it, if it becomes black it is not gold. If it is gold, then it will remain gold. In the same way, the mind of sentient beings has always been dharmatā. That being so, since it is demonstrated as the view, buddhahood is inherently accomplished since it has always been accomplished."

-- The Wheel of Ascertaining the View

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Good stretches for postration.

Content:

Tsultrim T. said:

Along the same line as the other posters, I think starting slowly is better than stretching. Take it easy and gradually build up how many you are doing per session and per day over time. A platform can be helpful but a wooden or other smooth floor will work just fine. Also having something for the hands to make it easier to slide is helpful. You can make it as easy or hard on yourself as you want, just remember it is supposed to be challenging and break down mental conceptions about body, pain, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Sun salutations is the healthiest way to do your prostrations [but that's "Hindu"...]

However, doing 108 in a row is probably a bad idea. It is better to focus on quality, not on quantity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 8th, 2013 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

yegyal said:

So a couple interesting side notes to this:

1. This is the first time ever that Chatral Rinpoche has been involved with the recognition of a tulku.

Glyn said:

That is debatable. Some would say that he has informally been involved before, although he has also been critical of the tradition.

For the record, he has also recently written a letter regarding one of a set of twins. I thought this was related to the Penor Yangsi, but it's obviously not the case.

Tsultrim T. said:

He was also quite involved in the Dudjom Yangsi recognition process, making it clear that the Tibetan yangsi, Dudjom Tulku Sangye Pema Zhepa, was the true tulku. Although over time it seems everyone's stance has softened on that.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence the flaw of partisan politics and biases in the Tulku system (Dudjom Yangsi, Karmapa, I am sure we can think of other instances).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I didn't ask what the commentary says, I can see what it says, I asked: are YOU currently enlightened?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no buddhahood apart from rigpa. So when I am I am, and when I am not, I am not. In other words, everyone can have that experience of awakening, even if they are an "ordinary person", like me, and presumably you.

In any event, that is not really the point. The point is that awakening is fundamental feature of sentient beings. Whether or not they can access that state depends solely on whether they have access to a proper guru, introduction and confidence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

The quote does not answer sherab's question. I personally would "dumb down" the question and simply ask: are you currently enlightened?

Malcolm wrote:

It precisely answers his question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

LastLegend said:

Nongradual. What does that mean?

Malcolm wrote:

The title is not really quite right, it should be "Dzogchen: Primordial Buddhahood?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Teachers are there to point out a buddhahood that is already present and always has been,

Sherab said:

Is buddhahood = enlighten state? If yes, does this mean that an enlightenment state

can be obscured? If so, when one becomes a buddha, what is there to prevent one's enlighten state from being obscured again? If it cannot be obscured, why is it that our original enlighten state can be obscured?

Malcolm wrote:

The erroneous path of the mind that places hope for a result from any virtue, perfections, samaya, practice of accomplishment and so on are said to be deviations from the great vehicle without effort. Now then, if one proposes a cause of realization, because the absence of any activity and the absence of thought are a conducive cause, vidyā is held to arise from within. Since there are many thoughts due to activities, this is not a cause [of realization], again there is obscuration because of many perceptions.

-- The Commentary of the Inner Great Potentiality of The Great Perfection

While we can respect the notion of buddhahood from gathering two accumulations, Dzogchen practitioners do not believe it. Nevertheless, we also do dedications and so on, but from a different POV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Definition of Yangsi vs. Tulku

Content:

smcj said:

I thought the word 'tulku' was the Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit word 'nirmanakaya'. No?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed it is, but it really cannot be taken literally when applied to to your average Tibetan reincarnated lama (not that HH Penor Rinpoche was "average" in any way")

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Nelson Mandela has died.

Content:

padma norbu said:

What good all-purpose prayers are there for the recently deceased? I know a Red Tara prayer, not sure if that's the best or maybe it doesn't matter.

Glyn said:

The Aspiration of Sukhavati, or Dewachen Monlam (de mon), from the Terton Mingyur Dorje is very common. There is a long one which takes about half an hour to chant and a much shorter one.

OM AMI DEWA HRIH

Malcolm wrote:

The long one is actually by Karma Chagmed, the short one is Namcho Migyur Dorje's personal vision of Sukhavati.

However in this case, since it is not clear that Nelson Mandela has any relationship with Dharma at all, it is better to do Shitro for him, and even better, a chang chog rite would be best.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: Nongradual Buddhahood?

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

So when student meets master, there will be no further passage of time between that and buddhahood?

Malcolm wrote:

You should start another thread.

Teachers are there to point out a buddhahood that is already present and always has been, as it states in the Inner Great Potentiality of Bodhicitta [byang chub kyi sems rtsal chen sprugs pa]:

Buddhas and sentient beings are nondual,
how could there be fabrication with a path?

However, a proper guru is indispensable, from the same text:

Without an authentic master, like the scripture of a monkey,
the basis and path will be erroneous, indeed one will be seized by conceptuality.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

So when student meets master, there will be no further passage of time between that and buddhahood?

Malcolm wrote:

You should start another thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 6:54 PM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Malcolm I am not sure how many people take the Hvashang stories literally these days. Even several Geshees I have spoken to are inclined to believe much of the stuff is polemical.

That being said, I still think the gradual approach has many benefits for those suited to it. The great majority of Buddhist paths advocate such an approach, and it is outlined clearly in the Buddhist canon. I don't think Lord Buddha would have spent so much teaching the superfluous- so I think such an approach must be appropriate for a great number of beings.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, my point for bringing up dzogchen is that it is an example of something being "secret", while in reality there is nothing truly offensive to be found in dzogchen tantras, unlike say, the laghusamvara. The main reason they are considered "secret" is, as I said, they reject the idea that buddhahood is something gradual, attained by gradually developing merit and wisdom. Ironically, dzogchen is kept secret precisely because of the responses garnered here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

Alfredo said:

Dzogchen is not so radical that it casts any doubt upon the institution of the lama.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is after all a Vajrayāna system. If someone wants to practice Dzogchen, they must of course have teacher of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

smcj said:

I was addressing the notion of what is "secret", why it is "secret", and the disparity in notions of secrecy.

There is an odd perspective in Dharma called the "One Yana" perspective. It is peculiar

to Vajrayana practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

The notion of "Ekayāna" in fact derives from a number of sūtras, most notable, the Saddharmapundarika.

It is not a particularly Vajrayāna sentiment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

why all the (off topic) trumpet blowing?

I was addressing the notion of what is "secret", why it is "secret", and the disparity in notions of secrecy.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

pueraeternus said:

I have the same notion: that the idea behind the "sudden enlightenment" traditions are a form of skillful means to get people to practice and step into the stream, whereupon it will be revealed to them that they still have a very long way to go, but it is okay since they have already glimpsed Nirvana and gained the patiences. So it is a reverse technique ala the Lotus Sutra, but applied to Mahayanists instead of Sravakayanists.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a sudden enlightenment school.

It is a "everything is already in a state of buddhahood and always has been so" school.

pueraeternus said:

Yes - that is the usual premise such schools rest on.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it's a little different than what you think. But it is off topic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The main "scary" thing about Dzogchen is that it teaches a path beyond cause and result. This is scary for all those people who are easily frightened by the Hashang boogyman, especially those who remain trenchantly committed to Kadampa gradualism.

Sherab Dorje said:

One could quite as easily argue that Dzogchen was devised in order to placate cowardly beings that are scared stiff by the thought that they may actually have to devote a few hundred thousand lifetimes (like the Buddha, for example) to slowly chipping away at the petrified crud that has encrusted their true nature. That it is a ploy to get scaredy-cats to not break a cold sweat over the daunting nature of the task and at least get them started on the path to liberation. I mean, since becoming a one eyed fan, has it not occurred to you that Dzogchen is just another skilful means? Anyway, if the whole deal is so "shit-hot" why all the (off topic) trumpet blowing?

pueraeternus said:

I have the same notion: that the idea behind the "sudden enlightenment" traditions are a form of skillful means to get people to practice and step into the stream, whereupon it will be revealed to them that they still have a very long way to go, but it is okay since they have already glimpsed Nirvana and gained the patiences. So it is a reverse technique ala the Lotus Sutra, but applied to Mahayanists instead of Sravakayanists.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a sudden enlightenment school.

It is a "everything is already in a state of buddhahood and always has been so" school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 7th, 2013 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Internet Buddhism

Content:

Glyn said:

How do you feel about the interactions of the internet and Dharma?

On one level it seems a great way to give access to teachings which would otherwise not be available to great numbers of people, but on the other hand it's also an enabler of a plethora of fakes, and semi-fakes, to promote themselves and for material which should be secret, becoming publically accessible.

Malcolm wrote:

The lack of internet in old Tibet did nothing to prevent the spawn of fakes and semi-

fakes.

Not only that, but in old Tibet, nothing was really secret provided you had \$\$\$.

There may be some things in the so called anuttara tantras which probably were meant to titillate the brahmin-born scholars in whose milieu such texts were generally revealed (things entirely unremarkable to a beggar living in the streets). But the Dzogchen tantras, for example are largely free of such elements, and yet are considered super secret, even though in general the doctrines promulgated in such texts are tame in comparison to the sorcery and "antinomian" elements of the Laghusamvara, for example.

The main "scary" thing about Dzogchen is that it teaches a path beyond cause and result. This is scary for all those people who are easily frightened by the Hashang boogyman, especially those who remain trenchantly committed to Kadampa gradualism.

The only valid reason for gradually apportioning practices to students in a gradual manner that I have found is to keep people from getting very conceptual about practices of which they have no experience. Frankly, there is very little that should be kept "secret", and some practices in Vajrayāna have to be acknowledged as socially inappropriate, harmful and sexist, products of a patriarchal era in which the role of women was subordinate to the religious fantasies of wealthy scholars.

Returning to my main point: the truth is that Vajrayāna has never really been that "secret" from the beginning. Indeed, its "secrecy" was its prime marketing device and remains so even to this day.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: recent Jogye controversy

Content:

zed said:

would those anti-gambling Buddhist groups refuse to accept a donation from me?

Serious question.

Malcolm wrote:

Serious answer. I won't refuse it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Punya said:

So would it be correct to say that an emanation is indicative of a higher state than that of a reincarnation? And is a tulku an emanation and a yangsi a reincarnation?

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. But as Sakya Pandita put it:

Even a common geshe is praised as an actual Buddha,
what is pleasing to poets is displeasing to scholars.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

An emanation is fully conscious before conception, during gestation and through his or her birth.

Punya said:

I know this is off topic but how does this definition distinguish the difference between emanation and reincarnation.

Malcolm wrote:

A reincarnation is not fully conscious through the entire process of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He would be an emanation of Vimalamitra. As the legend has it, Vimalamitra returns to Tibet every one hundred years.

M

Punya said:

Malcolm, can you explain what emanation means please.

Malcolm wrote:

An emanation is fully conscious before conception, during gestation and through his or

her birth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 6th, 2013 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

what's the difference between a yangsi and a tulku?

Malcolm wrote:

A yang srid [punarbhāva] is literally a reincarnation. A sprul sku is a nirmanakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 5th, 2013 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Yangsi Penor Rinpoche found!

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

reincarnation of Vimalamitra

Malcolm wrote:

He can't be a reincarnation of Vimalamitra since Vimalamitra, according to legend, attained 'pho ba chen po, and still lives at Wutai Shan.

He would be an emanation of Vimalamitra. As the legend has it, Vimalamitra returns to Tibet every one hundred years.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 4th, 2013 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Advice for the young layperson

Content:

flowerbudh said:

I have set my heart completely on liberating myself and all others from suffering... can any of you link me articles on how others have done this or provide your own insight... so, essentially, being a layperson (esp. young) and how to handle it. Thanks guys! <3

Malcolm wrote:

No one has ever managed to do this [i.e. liberate all others from suffering], not even the Buddha. But you can try.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 4th, 2013 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Tucker's research on reincarnation.

Content:

Indrajala said:

Now, the "variety of the world arises from the actions of living beings" is similar to saying "certain features of the universe and of living things are best explained by an intelligent cause rather than an undirected process such as natural selection". Beings in Buddhist philosophy generate karma as a result of willed action in varying degrees and types, which is saying that their variety is a result of intelligent causes, not strictly natural selection and mutations.

Malcolm wrote:

Its not similar at all.

Intelligence is accounted for in natural selection.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 1st, 2013 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Selling the dharma

Content:

dude said:

That's why we should present offerings without being asked or required to.

Malcolm wrote:

That works fine for sutrayāna teachings, but it is a nonstarter in Vajrayāna where empowerment fees and so on are stipulated in the tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 30th, 2013 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Nighthawk said:

As a PL Buddhist following a Japanese tradition, you're saying I should be chanting it Namō Amitabha Buddha instead of Namu Amida Butsu in order to achieve the full effect?

Malcolm wrote:

That's not a mantra. It's an homage, so saying "Homage to Buddha Amitabha" would also be as effective as either the Sanskrit or the Japanese, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 30th, 2013 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

smcj said:

The āryapañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstrābhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti states, for example:

"The bodhisattva mahāsattva who wishes to overwhelm the cittopāda of the pratyekabuddha (who rejoices in patience) trains in the perfection of wisdom".

The term "generation of bodhicitta" is a gloss for the term cittopāda, "generation of the intent". Intent for what? Intent for one of the three kinds of awakening, i.e., arhat, pratyekabuddha, or samyaksambuddha.

There are many examples like this in the literature of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra which extensively discusses the differences in the creation of the various "intents" to awaken. Well yes, obviously arhats and pratyekabuddhas have 'intents to awaken'. The question at hand is if that is properly called 'bodhicitta'. Your supporting citation is hardly a slam-dunk, but that's ok. This isn't really an important subject so let's drop it.

You're a busy man and I have no wish to make you do additional work. I'd rather not irritate you on this. I will save that privilege for something else that I see as more important.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the term "generation of [bodhi]citta" is what is usually translated by western translators as "generation of bodhicitta". For example, the Rangjung Yeshe dictionary gives:

sems bskyed - forming the resolve; motivation/ aspiration/ to resolve oneself;
1. Bodhichitta, producing the Bodhichitta, [bodhicittotpada]; 2) producing a thought; cultivation of an enlightened attitude. arousing / generating bodhichitta, mental disposition [when not particularly referring to the development of awakening mind]; aspiration; arousing / generating bodhichitta, cultivation of an enlightened attitude [ry]

All three, arhats, pratyekabuddhas and buddhas arises from an intent to awaken [bodhicitta]. Much of Mahāyāna polemical discourse around this is to make sure that Bodhisattvas do not fall into the bodhicitta of an arhat or pratyekabuddha. All three attain bodhi, therefore, it is a misconception to say that those who aspire to arhatship and pratyekabuddhahood have no bodhicitta, but it must be recognized that these bodhicittas are considered inferior bodhicittas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

dude said:

You're quite right about the two being so far apart, and I think this is a positive outcome. I imagine it produced some meaningful dialogue as well with increased understanding for both parties.

mindyourmind said:

For me it was more a reminder of the positions that the two worldviews take, and the gulf of differences that remain, has to remain, in discussions like these.

dude said:

You're right, but it really bothers me because I believe in Buddhism. They're wrong, and cause suffering to self and others. Maybe I can't convince them in some cases, but it's really too bad.

What bothers me even more is Buddhists who refuse to believe in karma and rebirth. That's downright scary.

Malcolm wrote:

It is better not to be so attached to views that it causes you to have an emotional reaction when you find out that there are those who hold different views.

Theism, a belief in god, has brought peace to millions of people's minds.

Second, you don't know that they are wrong, any more than atheists are not right in asserting there is no karma and rebirth. These are all abstractions, concepts. While I personally accept rebirth and karma, I am not going to insist it is true, other than to insist it is part of the Buddhas teachings and needs to be respected as such. But there is no orthodoxy to defend in Dharma, because Dharma is based on personal experience and not on adherence to a set of views. There are many Buddhists who like the bulk of Buddha's ethical and meditative teachings, who nevertheless don't accept rebirth because they have no memories from their past lives and so on. People are better left in freedom to figure things out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

xabir said:

Because Mahāyāna sutras and tantras are filled with Indian myths and legends.

mt meru cosmology originated from pali suttas yes?

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.32.0.piya.html>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, also the Pali canon is filled with Indian myths and legends.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

smcj said:

I think Malcolm is incorrect about calling the aspiration to become an arhat as a 'grade of bodhicitta'.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, in Mahāyāna texts, bodhicitta is presented in exactly this way -- do you really want me to drag out the citations?

smcj said:

Yes please.

Malcolm wrote:

The āryapañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstrābhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti states, for example:

"The bodhisattva mahāsattva who wishes to overwhelm the cittopāda of the pratyekabuddha (who rejoices in patience) trains in the perfection of wisdom".

The term "generation of bodhicitta" is a gloss for the term cittopāda, "generation of the intent". Intent for what? Intent for one of the three kinds of awakening, i.e., arhat, pratyekabuddha, or samyaksambuddha.

There are many examples like this in the literature of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra which extensively discusses the differences in the creation of the various "intents" to awaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

smcj said:

I think Malcolm is incorrect about calling the aspiration to become an arhat as a 'grade of bodhicitta'.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, in Mahāyāna texts, bodhicitta is presented in exactly this way -- do you really want me to drag out the citations?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Of course we need to decide whether these stories are true or not, but I would contend that Buddhism gives us tools for believing the fantastical. If everything is the mere creation of our mind, like in a dream, and nothing exists from its own side, then anything can appear in accordance with karma. The only thing that is impossible is inherent existence. A true scientific understanding of the mind according to Buddha's teachings make many hidden objects logically provable such as past and future lives, karma, the existence of god realms and hell realms and Pure Lands.

Malcolm wrote:

You realize this is merely medieval style casuistry?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 29th, 2013 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Indrajala said:

...but not so much with Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans, being among the last Asians to encounter the colonial west, still resist modernity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

jeeprs said:

So, as I said, what is a better translation for 'Bodhicitta' than 'Compassion'?

Malcolm wrote:

In the Mahāyāna context, "the intent to awaken".

Tenzin Dorje said:

"for the sake of all sentient beings" (on the basis of having realized perfect and complete enlightenment, the ripening of all positive qualities and the elimination of all non-virtues, as the way to actually help countless sentient beings ; this is why thinking - of it - is important)

Malcolm wrote:

NO, you cannot make that statement -- because while the term bodhicitta is only defined in Mahāyāna, there are different grades of bodhicitta, the intent to awaken as an arhat, and so on. It is only the intent to awaken as a buddha for the benefit of all

sentient beings that we describe as the true Mahāyāna bodhicitta, but there are in fact different intents to awaken, not all of which spring from compassion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Indrajala said:

...then people can compose their own prayers and commentaries, or do their practices exclusively in English with it being completely valid and orthodox, rather than reciting in Tibetan and then in a dead tone saying the English.

In due time the English traditions would be settled and have less need to defer to Tibetan sources or even Tibetan teachers.

Jainarayan said:

Would this include translating mantras into the vernacular? Everything I've read says that mantras lose their effectiveness unless recited or chanted in the original language, or close to it. So, I don't mean sound shifts like om mani padme hum to om mani peme hung. That's a case of approximating the sounds between languages, not any kind of literal or word for word translation. The Mahakaruna Dharani and Ushisha Vijaya Dharani do translate into English, but do they have the same effect (I don't know if there is a fully translated into Tibetan version).

I'm not challenging, just curious.

Malcolm wrote:

Mantras are a special case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Indrajala said:

What if Tibetan Buddhism in the west transitions to a primarily English medium?

Malcolm wrote:

It's not a what if. Parroting syllables in a language one does not speak is unsustainable.

Indrajala said:

In due time the English traditions would be settled and have less need to defer to

Tibetan sources or even Tibetan teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

English is the new international Dharma language.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

jeeprs said:

I think it is perfectly sound to translate bodhicitta as 'compassion'. It is often translated that way.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a) unsound and b) no one translates bodhicitta as compassion (karuna).

Why is it unsound? Every person who has bodhicitta has compassion, but not every person who has compassion also has bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

jeeprs said:

So, as I said, what is a better translation for 'Bodhicitta' than 'Compassion'?

Malcolm wrote:

In the Mahāyāna context, "the intent to awaken".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That's a novel approach. Where, in any work of these two masters, do they claim to have personally visited Meru?

Tsongkhapa said:

Asanga travelled to Tushita Pure Land with Maitreya (not merely had meditational experiences of Tushita) so he would have seen it as it would be below this realm. In Nagajuna's biography it says that during the period of his second Turning of the Wheel he went to the Northern Continent of the four that surround Mount Meru and taught there for two hundred and fifty years, so he would have seen it too.

To use another example, are we to say that Tushita and Akanishta Pure Lands do not

exist because they have never been the objects of human valid cognitions? (actually, while being generally true that humans cannot see Tushita Pure Land, Asanga saw it with his human conventionally valid eye consciousness).

No, this is false. Asanga had meditational experience of Tushita. He did not observe Tushita with his physical eyes

What's your source for this belief? In the widely accepted biographies of Asanga he physically travelled to Tushita and spent fifty human years there, so of course he saw it.

Malcolm wrote:

If you like reading religious novels and accepting them as truth, go for it. As for the Asanga story, I am basing myself on Chinese sources that are much earlier than Tibetan sources.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

the five skandhas are also impermanent, as with the skillful means they ripen into the 5 primordial wisdoms.

philji said:

At a certain level this just seems yada yada yada.....why do Buddhists love to quote stuff like this when asked to help someone.....who does it help?

Malcolm wrote:

yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

The real nature is Buddha Wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is just a name, like suchness, emptiness, luminosity, the limit of reality, nirvana, etc., which are all synonyms.

Son of Buddha said:

Emptiness is a negation, meaning the lack thereof if Enlightenment was sheer emptiness it would be nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddha taught only three gateways to liberation:

śūnyatā
alakṣaṇa
apranidāna.

Emptiness, absence of characteristics and absence of aspiration.

He did not teach a fourth gate of liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

SittingSilent said:

What then is this "real nature" you speak of? And mind? I read a lot about mind in Pema Chodron's books.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness.

dude said:

no it isn't

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is. You can all it "luminosity" if you want, but that is also empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 28th, 2013 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Jainarayan said:

...it's Tibetan custom to end practices with Om Ah Hung 3 times.

Malcolm wrote:

No it isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Native vs. Tibetan language

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Admittedly, one could logically extend that line of thought and argue that Sanskrit syllables should be used rather than Tibetan ones, but I feel the Tibetan syllables to have no more or less ritual efficacy, and to be no more or less authentic than the Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no one standard Sanskrit shape. For example, the syllables e vaṃ; most of the explanations of these two phonemes in the tantras involve their shape, shapes which they have in some Sanskrit syllabaries, but not all, and not in Tibetan.

For example, the scripts used for the Nyingma tantras in Sanskrit in the 8th century could not be read by Indian Panditas in the 11th century.

In the end the shape of the letter merely represents a sound...it is the sound that is important, not the shape of the phoneme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

SittingSilent said:

What then is this "real nature" you speak of? And mind? I read a lot about mind in Pema Chodron's books.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I guess it depends on how far you want to take it.

According to traditional Indian (Vedic) cosmology the moon landing could have never happened because the scriptures indicate it is the abode of Chandra and the distance calculations are incorrect. Zealously holding to this view did not win the Hare Krishnas many supporters. Below are the founder, Swami Prabhupada's, comments on the issue:

Malcolm wrote:

Incorrect according to a religious text, much in the same vein as the Buddhist texts which make similar cosmological claims.

Ancient Indian Astronomy texts at least are based on mathematical calculations and centuries of specialized observation and records.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I submit that no human being ever perceived Mt. Meru with a conventionally valid cognition. Mt. Meru is and always been a cosmological Indian myth about which there are various and conflicting traditions.

Tsongkhapa said:

Asanga and Nagarjuna have both seen it.

Malcolm wrote:

That's a novel approach. Where, in any work of these two masters, do they claim to have personally visited Meru?

Tsongkhapa said:

They were great realised beings, so I submit that they had conventionally valid cognitions.

Malcolm wrote:

But there is no evidence that they held forth the idea that they had personally visited Meru. So you are merely engaging in proliferation, rank conceptual fabrication.

Tsongkhapa said:

To use another example, are we to say that Tushita and Akanishta Pure Lands do not exist because they have never been the objects of human valid cognitions? (actually, while being generally true that humans cannot see Tushita Pure Land, Asanga saw it with his human conventionally valid eye consciousness).

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is false. Asanga had meditational experience of Tushita. He did not observe Tushita with his physical eyes.

Tsongkhapa said:

We cannot say that something doesn't exist just because we cannot perceive it.

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't it strike you as odd that certain facts about the world never change (sun, moon and stars), while other facts (flat earth --> round earth) do? Basically, all this indicates to me is that we have become better at analyzing and investigating the world, not worse, and that such obsolete cosmologies as the one we are discussing come from a time prior to that ability -- i.e. these suppositions could not be tested.

Tsongkhapafan said:

If Mount Sumeru is mythological, why is it referred to in the Sutras and Tantras (for example, Heruka's palace is on top of Mount Meru)?

Malcolm wrote:

Because Mahāyāna sutras and tantras are filled with Indian myths and legends.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

if my mind can perceive the thoughts, past lives and so forth of others, how can I say that others' minds exist outside my own? .

Malcolm wrote:

But your mind cannot. You do not have the five kinds of clairvoyance. So this argument is not valid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: Oldest Buddhist Shrine Uncovered In Nepal

Content:

sukhamanveti said:

Now it looks as though one of the older chronologies may have been vindicated.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so fast. It is well established that the Buddha was born to his mother on a trip to a remote location. It is well known that ancient Indians maintained sacred groves [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sacred_groves_of_India] from time immemorial.

Without datable evidence of specifically Buddhist artifacts, it is too soon to use this as supporting the more traditional dates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

SittingSilent said:

then what gives rise to the sense of me-ness?

Malcolm wrote:

Ignorance of your real nature.

The body is not your self.

Mind and mental factors are not your self.

You have no self external to the mind and body.

Your self is not the body and mind taken together.

However, one designates the body and mind as a self based on convention, and that is fine. There is no other "self" than the conventional one designated on the complex of aggregates.

It is true that some later Mahāyāna trends attempt to define suchness, or the real nature of phenomena as a "self" -- but these trends did not gain much currency in Indian Buddhism because the tortured rhetoric of "self" vs. "nonself" utilized by these trends merely serves to reinforce the concept that a self cannot be ascertained in one's five aggregates, separate from one's five aggregates or is all one's five aggregates together.

Conventionally, there is no problem using the term self. The problem arises when one imputes permanent identity, i.e. an ultimate self, onto the continuum we are now referring to as "SittingSilent", etc.

You might read Hume's refutation of the self. It's sometimes helpful for those trying to grasp what the Buddha meant by absence of self:

According to the standard interpretation of Hume on personal identity, he was a bundle theorist, who held that the self is nothing but a bundle of experiences ("perceptions") linked by the relations of causation and resemblance; or, more accurately, that the empirically warranted idea of the self is just the idea of such a bundle. This view is forwarded by, for example, positivist interpreters, who saw Hume as suggesting that terms such as "self", "person", or "mind" referred to collections of "sense-contents".[58] A modern-day version of the bundle theory of the mind has been advanced by Derek Parfit in his *Reasons and Persons* (1986).

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Hume#The_self

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

The non-existence of Mount Meru FOR US is easily proved by it not being either a hidden or manifest object, but our view is not inherently the only one. The world is subjectively existent. We don't see pus and blood or nectar when we observe liquid...

Malcolm wrote:

This presumes there is a common basis of karmically determined perceptions, i.e. for a single vessel of a liquid, there are six different perceptions.

Now then, the perception of a Mt. Meru and the non-perception of Mt. Meru must have a common basis of perception if we are to accept your analogy.

We are not talking about the conventionally valid cognitions of beings of the six realms, we are only talking about the conventionally valid cognitions of human beings.

I submit that no human being ever perceived Mt. Meru with a conventionally valid cognition. Mt. Meru is and always been a cosmological Indian myth about which there are various and conflicting traditions.

Ancient Indian astronomical works as the Suryasiddhanta clearly describe our world as being round and suspended in space like an iron ball between two magnets. Further:

"The Surya Siddhanta also estimates the diameters of the planets. The estimate for the diameter of Mercury is 3,008 miles, an error of less than 1% from the currently accepted diameter of 3,032 miles. It also estimates the diameter of Saturn as 73,882 miles, which again has an error of less than 1% from the currently accepted diameter of 74,580. Its estimate for the diameter of Mars is 3,772 miles, which has an error within 11% of the currently accepted diameter of 4,218 miles. It also estimated the diameter of Venus as 4,011 miles and Jupiter as 41,624 miles, which are roughly half the currently accepted values, 7,523 miles and 88,748 miles, respectively."

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Surya_Siddhanta

Indian astronomers, while generally subscribing to a geocentric cosmology, were more advanced in their thinking than the mythic superstitions of Buddhist abhidharmikas, for whom Mt. Meru is only viewable by siddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

Arjan Dirkse said:

Emptiness is a bit of misnomer when used to refer to sunyata.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is actually a very precise translation.

Arjan Dirkse said:

OK, the word "misnomer" is a misnomer then...

Still, emptiness in the Buddhist sense is something else to me than what is normally conveyed by the meaning of the English word emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

The term simply means when something lacks something, that lack is termed "emptiness".

For example, the cullasunnata sutta, the lack of a city in a village is the designated as the emptiness of the village.

In yogacara "emptiness" means the perfected nature, i.e., the absence of subject and object (the imagined nature) in the dependent nature.

In madhyamaka, the absence of the four extremes in relative phenomena is ultimate, i.e. the emptiness of the things.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

futerko said:

Let me come back to this...

The logical consequence of dependent origination is that nothing originates

PadmaVonSamba said:

No, it means that no thing originates.

In other words, in dependent origination, there is no intrinsically, self-arising thing.

futerko said:

You seem to be suggesting that something originates which is somehow not a thing.

As Oushi wrote, "To talk about time, you need change." So where do you locate any event or any arising outside of any reference to the present?

Without needing to be enlightened, we still know that time appears as a succession of moments in which change appears to occur in those subsequent moments, so if we locate temporal infinity anywhere other than right here and now then we find ourselves in a dead end - positing an uncaused cause.

Malcolm wrote:

Time depends on objects, when objects cannot be ascertained, neither can time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 27th, 2013 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Struggling with the Concept of No/Non-Self/Emptiness

Content:

Arjan Dirkse said:

Emptiness is a bit of misnomer when used to refer to sunyata.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is actually a very precise translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 26th, 2013 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

(having already defined parabhāva as a species of svabhāva) "Where is there a bhāva which is not included in svabhāva or parabhāva?"

cloudburst said:

This is all irrelevant, as you know. This is Nagarjuna arguing against the existence of essences. No one is claiming that. Sophistry will not win the day here, although you may impress the credulous.

Malcolm wrote:

Here, Nāgārjuna is pointing out in no uncertain terms that all assertions of existence and non-existence are fraught with notion of essences automatically. It is one thing to accept that tables and chairs "exist" prior to analysis. It is quite another to assert their existence is valid predicated on deluded cognitions, i.e. a cognition of a non-veridical object, which is in essence what a conventional truth is.

The clause "therefore, since that is so...", only intends to affirm that sense organs and so on are products of the ripening of action, as previously stated, in conformity with worldly convention -- but it is not a statement of commitment on Candrakīrti's part that worldly convention is truthful, which is why he remarks that one should not get involved with how it actually is.

Affirming that eyes are products is all I need. Since they are produced according to worldly convention, they must exist according to worldly convention.

Worldly convention is predicated on cognitions of non-veridical objects, i.e. it is dependent on false cognitions. What does it matter if eyes and so on are products if the very substrate upon which the acceptance of their status as products is in itself delusion?

Madhyamakas do not make propositions concerning existence. They accept whatever is in common discourse merely for the purpose of demonstrating (to those that care) that the terms of common discourse they are using are deluded and false. What is the root delusion? Assertions of existence which always involve notions of inherency. As much as Tsongkhapa wanted to sever the discussion of called "mere existence" or conventional existence from inherent or ultimate existence, in reality, one cannot hew

the two apart.

Nagarjuna's point, very simple put, is that when there are essences, only then can there be existences. When there are no essences, then there can be no existences. Such existences that are spoken about are understood to be merely conventional (meaning imputed, meaning not real), predicated on the deluded cognition of ordinary persons. These are accepted provisionally by Madhyamaka, but not asserted by Madhyamaka.

The Gelug commitment to arguing essenceless existence is fruitless because there are is no such thing as an essenceless existence. This is why it is necessary to negate merely inherent existence, but rather one must negate all four extremes in both the relative and the ultimate -- only this is the profound emptiness taught in Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 26th, 2013 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

smcj said:

Whereas the Buddhists simply say that there is an infinite regression

futerko said:

No, they don't. The whole point of Buddhism is to avoid such an issue of infinite regress.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, Buddhists accept certain kinds of infinite regression as a logical consequence of dependent origination, for example, the infinite regression of dependent causality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 26th, 2013 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

mindyourmind said:

[

What he wants to know (and here my theism may be letting me down) is "Who made it?" In the theistic worldview all of these questions of course have a wonderfully pat answer.

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is that we (every sentient beings in the universe) all did by the force of our past actions which have no beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 25th, 2013 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: BASIS FOR KARMA / REBIRTH

Content:

mindyourmind said:

To put it in its simplest form, where does karma / rebirth "come from"? Who created such an exquisitely complex system, if there is no god?

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is volition and what proceeds from volition, state Buddha, Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu. Karma/rebirth, therefore come from the mind.

One important Buddhist tenet is beginninglessness. There is no absolute beginning.

All the diversity that we see in the universe is a result of all the individual actions of all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 25th, 2013 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

It's a good question that I've been giving some thought. I think it's because Buddha did - he said there is no creator other than mind, so although mind doesn't exist from its own side it's still the creator of all our experiences. In the Mahamudra teachings Buddha said "if you realise your own mind, you will become a Buddha. You should not seek Buddhahood elsewhere." I think it's possible to assert the primacy of mind without being a Chittamatrin, especially because karma arises from intention, which is part of mind, and the world arises from conceptual imputation which is the major function of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that line of reasoning suffers from infinite regress?

Tsongkhapa said:

I'm curious why - please explain Malcolm

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there are two problems: one your mind is not the only mind. This automatically means that unless you are a solipsist, you automatically must accept the existence of external entities that are not products of your mind, i.e. other minds.

Second, when you claim that everything is a product of one's own mind, including the causes and conditions that give rise to the mind itself, you are locked in an infinite regress, essentially asserting that the mind causes itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 25th, 2013 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: switching from vajrayana to theravada for some time

Content:

dude said:

The Buddha wouldn't agree with the Theravadin monks. They embrace the provisional and reject the essential.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddha? The Mahāyāna one?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 24th, 2013 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Goenka Retreat

Content:

duckfiasco said:

* it's run entirely by donations, which I found impressive

Malcolm wrote:

They will hit you up for a donation when you leave.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 22nd, 2013 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

This is why Nāgārjuna also wrote: "An existent [bhāva] 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. How can there be arising?" Nagarjuna would have hated quantum mechanics, where things pop into and out of existence for no good reason.

Hey, doesn't that negate all his philosophy?

Malcolm wrote:

It simply means we don't have the math to understand the causality of a given phenomena, it doesn't entail the consequence that Nāgārjuna's opening statement in the MMK is incorrect:

"At no time and in no place does anything arise from itself, from other than itself, from both, or in absence of a cause."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 21st, 2013 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Actually, they DO assert it. Many many examples of this can be provided. For the purposes of this discussion we will accept your own translation above "Mādhyamikas are proponents of dependent origination."

Malcolm wrote:

That is not an assertion of existence.

cloudburst said:

Of course it is.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't. It is for this reason that Nāgārjuna asks the question (having already defined parabhāva as a species of svabhāva) "Where is there a bhāva which is not included in svabhāva or parabhāva?" Since there is no such thing, to call "dependent origination" a proposition of bhāva is incredibly wrong-headed. This is why Nāgārjuna also wrote: "An existent [bhāva] 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. How can there be arising?"

cloudburst said:

The translators are using inferences to translate the meaning, not just the words. So when they say "therefore they do exist" (which you render as "this is so"), they do so in order to demonstrate that eyes are dependently arisen results of karma. This means that they exist conventionally, so there is no problem in saying so in order to convey the meaning of the citation.

Malcolm wrote:

The clause "therefore, since that is so...", only intends to affirm that sense organs and so on are products of the ripening of action, as previously stated, in conformity with worldly convention -- but it is not a statement of commitment on Candrakīrti's part that worldly convention is truthful, which is why he remarks that one should not get involved with how it actually is.

The translation (in this instance) is not successful and does not convey the meaning Candrakīrti intends. Therefore, when you use it as a citation in support of a reason, the reason also fails. No, I did not have it lying around. Since the translation seemed a bit too pat to me, I examined the source of the citation and found it was slightly off when compared to the Tibetan. The term yod pa can be a translation of several different terms, ranging from asti to sat:

yod pa - saṃ√vid:samvidyamāna

yod pa - saṃniveśa

yod pa - sat
yod pa - sadbhāva
yod pa - sāmṇidhya
yod pa - a-vaikalya
yod pa - /as:asti
yod pa - astitā
yod pa - /vid:vidyate
yod pa - vidyamānatā
yod pa - vidyamāna
yod pa - upa√labh:upalabhyante
yod pa - /bhū:bhavati

Since we do not have the sanskrit original of this commentary, it is a little hard to say what the proper rendering of yod pa is here in "de phyir, de yod pas", it could just as easily be "since that exists" as "since that is so". However, given that context, and given the fact that "de yod pas" bears the instrumental "s" on the yod pa, it is unlikely that to mean : "Therefore, they do exist", especially when there is no plural corresponding to "they" such as "de dag" (eṣām).

An endemic problem in online discussions is the use of citations people haven't the skill to investigate themselves in either a Sanskrit original or in a secondary language such as Tibetan. In order to have a meaningful discussion, we must have first translations we actually agree upon. If we cannot achieve that much, it is difficult to have a meaningful exchange. This is also compounded with the fact that most of these discussions are not predicated on detailed discussions of the source texts, but rather post 12th century Tibetans involved in polemics with agendas often quite removed from the context in which these texts were composed. It is for this reason I generally abstain from discussions about Tibetan Madhyamaka any more, other than to observe that Tibetans after the 12th century, such as Dolbuba, Tsongkhapa, Gorampa (who in fact does not faithfully portray the early Sakya view) and so on began to introduce novelties to Madhyamaka discussion. Khenpo Zhenga tried to remedy this by restoring study of original commentaries and texts, but thus far western disciples of Tibetans still remain committed to whatever sectarian division they were initially trained in.

On the other hand I am certainly happy to talk about Indian Madhyamaka as long as it is understood that citations from Tibetans are excluded from the discussion, since I decided long ago that Tibetan Madhyamaka was a waste of time.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, November 21st, 2013 at 10:03 PM
Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?
Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's a good question that I've been giving some thought. I think it's because Buddha did - he said there is no creator other than mind, so although mind doesn't exist from its own side it's still the creator of all our experiences. In the Mahamudra teachings Buddha said "if you realise your own mind, you will become a Buddha. You should not seek Buddhahood elsewhere." I think it's possible to assert the primacy of mind without being a Chittamatrin, especially because karma arises from intention, which is part of mind, and the world arises from conceptual imputation which is the major function of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that line of reasoning suffers from infinite regress?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 21st, 2013 at 8:10 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

cloudburst said:

Actually, they DO assert it. Many many examples of this can be provided. For the purposes of this discussion we will accept your own translation above "Mādhyamikas are proponents of dependent origination."

Malcolm wrote:

That is not an assertion of existence.

Chandrakirti said:

We refute here that things exist essentially; we do not refute that eyes and such are products. and are dependently arisen results of karma. Therefore they exist. Hence, when eyes and so forth are explained only as results of karma, they do exist.

Malcolm wrote:

This passage's translation is not correct.

ཁོ་ལོ་ཅག་ནི་འདིར་དངོས་པོ་རྣམས་རང་གི་ངོ་བོས་གྲུབ་པ་འགོག་གི་མེད་ལ་སྟགས་པ་བྱས་ཤིང་རྟེན་ཅིང་འབྲེལ་པར་འབྱུང་བའི་ལས་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པར་སྣོན་པ་ཉིད་ནི་མི་འགོག་པའོ། །དེ་འབྱུང་དེ་ཡོད་པས་གང་ཞིག་རྣམ་པར་སྣོན་པ་ཉིད་དུ་བསྟན་པས་མེད་ལ་སྟགས་པ་ཡོད་པ་ཉིད་དོ།

"We are here refuting that things are proven [grub] through their own entity [svarūpa], but products such as eyes and so on are not refuted, being a ripening of dependently originated actions. Therefore, that is so because that which has been explained as being a ripening are eyes and so on.

So I can't accept your reason here because the citation is not correctly translated as far as I am concerned. Further, the point of the citation is not to prove existence of eyes and so forth, but rather in the original text, the point of the citation is demonstrate that:

དེའི་ཕྱིར་མཁས་པས་འཇིག་རྟེན་པའི་དོན་ལ་ཇི་སྐད་བཤད་པའི་རྣམ་པར་དབྱུང་པ་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་མཐོང་བ་དང་རྗེས་སུ་མཐུན་པ་མ་བཞུག་པར་ལས་རྣམས་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པར་སྣོན་པ་བས་མ་གྱིས་མི་བྱུང་པ་ཉིད་དུ་ལས་སྟངས་

"Therefore, the wise who investigate according to how it is explained in the mundane meaning accept the inconceivable ripening of actions without getting correspondingly involved with seeing reality [de ko na nydi, tattvaṃ]."

Thus, the citation does not say what you want it to say, nor does it match the point you wish to make.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 21st, 2013 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

As far as claiming 3rd turning as provisional goes the chapter 7 of the Samdhinirmocana Sutra states the first and second turning are provisional and the third turning is definite. As does the Nirvana sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

There are different ways to read the hermeneutic of the three turnings.

One has to present a logical reason why the so called third turning is superior to the second turning. Then one has to carefully identify which texts are actually referred to as such and so on. Personally, I don't think the three turnings are important. Why? Because this was just a scheme by one anonymous author to elevate his own text above other texts.

Further, the elaboration of a third wheel merely shows that texts like the Samdhinirmocana and the Nirvana sūtra are not part of the wave of original Mahāyāna texts, and belong to the second wave of Mahāyāna revelation.

In reality, the concept of the three turnings, which becomes so important in Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism receives almost no commentarial attention from Indians themselves in the Indian treatises.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But your mind too does not exist from its own side...so what does it depend on?

Tsongkhapafan said:

Mind depends upon many factors such as its parts, energy winds, previous moments and objects.

Malcolm wrote:

Uh huh -- so why privilege mind as the arbiter of external appearances?

Why don't you just simple say "If you have the dependent origination to perceive x, then you will"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

LOL

I'm on your side Malcolm.

tobes said:

Why are you so eager to choose a side and denounce anyone that you think is on the "Other" side?

dzogchungpa said:

Which side is Malcolm on anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

I wish someone would tell me, it would make life so much easier.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What article are you referencing, the funerary buddhism one?

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

yeah.

<http://www.thlib.org/collections/texts/jiats/#!jiats=/01/germano/b8/>

Malcolm wrote:

This simply means that contemporary tertons were working with the same system of

praxis in the late 11th and 12th century; it does not render snying thig superior to yang ti.

I imagine the real success of the snying thig literature is actually the compelling and fabulously rich narrative provided to it by the lo rgyus chen mo. Simply put, Zhang ston simply wrote a more interesting legend of the transmission of Dzogchen than other contemporary accounts at that point in time (mid 12th century). Of course, his account was swiftly eclipsed by the Padmasambhava legend revealed/composed/reworked by his younger contemporary, Nyang ral.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

Even if Dzogchen is Tibetan, it still developed within a 100% Buddhist environment according to scholars.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But I don't think anyone disputed this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

If yangti is a copy, then the original is better.

Of course I could be misunderstanding Germano.

Malcolm wrote:

What article are you referencing, the funerary buddhism one?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

So we can say the unsurpassed secret cycle of nyingthig is superior to yangti.

Malcolm wrote:

What is your reasoning concerning this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Now that I have thought about it I am not sure this is a phenomenon completely outside our Western religious traditions. Does the Pope not call Catholics "Children of the Flock." All the priests in my father's Irish Catholic side of the family are called "Father", and nuns are called "Sister" or "Mother" depending on their rank.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and look where infantilizing Catholics brought the Catholic Church.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Emptiness means that things do not exist from their own side in the least which means that 'reality' depends on your mind.

Malcolm wrote:

But your mind too does not exist from its own side...so what does it depend on?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

even going so far as to call them "children" to their faces.

muni said:

Lol. I should see that as an invitation to come home.

"The "coming home" is like the son recognizing his mother. Like a young child leaping up & embracing her".

<http://www.sofiatopia.org/bodhi/dzogchen.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

It was not intended as affection...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 20th, 2013 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Presumably Mipham's description of dharmakaya/nature of mind/whatever in Gateway is Nyingma sutra level view?

Malcolm wrote:

Strictly so.

dzogchungpa said:

I believe you have said that in dzogchen, the thigle of elements in the heart is considered tathāgatagarbha. Is there a distinct Nyingma tantra level view of these things, i.e. something between sutra and dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

Thus we can consider him as the normative Indian position, especially since he was from Vikramshila.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't really believe there was a normative Indian position. There were normative Tibetan biases about what more modern Madhyamaka teachings they were going to seek because of Atisha, but this does not mean that Atisha position was even a majority position in India. Recall too, Atisha, while proclaiming Candrakirti's virtue, never had anything of his translated. Instead Atisha sponsored the translation of Pseudo-Bhavaviveka's Tarkajvala, etc.

Also keep in mind that "Candrakirti's" popularity most likely had more to do with the tantric Candrakirti's commentaries on the Pañcakrama than Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I think that Malcolm has a point that cultivating multiple relationships with teachers can give one context to prevent abuse and narrow sectarianism.

heart said:

I agree, I feel I sounded a bit too dogmatic in my response to Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

I tend to provoke that response in people of late.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

narraboth said:

Sounds like some masters don't expect their students to act like adults.

Malcolm wrote:

I have met a few lamas who do not respect their (western) students as the adults that they are, and treat them like children, even going so far as to call them "children" to their faces. Of course, this is not a searing indictment of all Tibetan lamas. For the most part, most I have met treat their students with dignity and care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Teachers really cannot discern your capacity unless they have known you for years.

M

AlexanderS said:

I thought an authentic teacher would be able to discern a student's capacity immediately through their supramundane knowledge or is that just fantasy?

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of authentic teachers; some of them might have clairvoyance. Most however are just ordinary people like ourselves, trying to give us a hand up out of samsara while helping themselves as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

So to summarize the errors of those who promote Tathāgatarbha Sutras.

1. They don't understand all the normative ancient Indian professors like Atisha said Madhyamaka was the definitive sutra teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Just to be fair: Longchenpa states very clearly in the sgrub mtha' mdzod that Prasanga is the definitive view, Tathāgatarbha sutras are the definitive sutras.

Second, there was in India a broad group of masters who dissented from the position you ascribe. Recall, Atisha is very, very late on the scene and had virtually no influence on Indian Buddhism that is presently discernible, apart from being a younger contemporary of Naropa, Ratnakarashanti, Vageshvarakirti, and so on.

Also, Candrakirti seems to have left very little lasting impression on Indian Madhyamaka until Atisha's time, when his works began to be upheld with enthusiasm. This is evident by the controversy they eventually sparked, leading the composition of such texts as Ratnakarashanti's (Yogacara) Madhyamaka-alamkara.

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

2. They don't understand there is a difference between tantric Buddha Nature of Mahamudra and sutric Buddha Nature of Tathāgatarbha Sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this point is confusing for many people. It is made more confusing when scholars like Longchenpa regularly invoke the Uttaratantra in order to introduce concepts in Dzogchen causing people to conflate sugatarbha teachings as they appear in Dzogchen and sūtra.

nyamssnanggong'phel said:

3. They don't understand tantra is higher than sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, they can't be blamed for this since Sapan strongly argued against this position (indeed arguing against the position of his own guru, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltzen). Since then, virtually all schools but Nyingma have maintained that the view of sutra and tantra is the same, differing only in means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

[

If that is what it boils down to, doesn't that sort of put a downer on a lot of dzogchen material?

Malcolm wrote:

For some people it does, which is why they stick with causal and resultant paths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, I happen to be reading "Gateway to Knowledge" volume 4, and maybe we could discuss the passage beginning on p.33 in the "Nirvana Is Peace" section as follows: Even more than that, by having discarded all the passing stains from the cognizant nature of mind, it becomes the identity of great natural purity, the ultimate transformation of fully perfected abandonment and realization, the dharmakaya, [the body of buddha qualities] This has countless qualities, but to summarize, these are transcendent purity, bliss, permanence and identity.

I'm assuming you have access to it, and the Tibetan is facing it. The "transcendent identity" mentioned above is "bdag gi pha rol tu phyin pa" in the Tibetan for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, perfection of identity, described in the Uttaratantra as being beyond self and non-self:

Having purified the proliferation of self and non-self

Since [the proliferation] is completely pacified, it is the highest self.

But, you have to realize that reality has been described already in the Uttaratantra as free from all extremes of proliferation. The dharmakāya is defined as the wisdom of Jinas, which is course is why it cannot be seen even by tenth stage bodhisattvas since they still possess a thin veil of the knowledge obscuration.

Here, that which is being described as the nature of the mind, the mind essence, is what Mipham is describing.

As far as Buddha qualities go -- it is appalling funny to see grown men arguing over whether the Buddha's penis withdrawn into a pouch ultimately exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 8:26 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmakāya (emptiness) can be a potential. The problem with you is that you can only see things one way.

Son of Buddha said:

so Dharmakaya is only the potential to become Enlightened (which was you exact position on Buddha nature)

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say only, I said "can", it really depends on what you are defining as Dharmakāya -
- and there are many ways to look at the issue.

Madhyamakas have one approach; Yogacara's a different approach and so on.

Why don't you provide us with a definition for Dharmakāya and we can start from there?

How about the ārya-dharmasaṃgīti-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

"dharmakāya is the nirvana of the tathagatā".

Or ārya-trikāya-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

"dharmakāya means the absence of inherent existence like space"

Or the parinirvāṇasūtra:

"Without having exhausted afflictions, dharmakāya always exists"

These three statements for example can be seen as non-contradictory in the following way:

The Buddha realized nirvana; nirvana is the dharmakāya; dharmakāya is the absence of inherent existence, the absence of inherent existence, i.e. dharmakāya is a permanent fact of reality.

Here, we have an example of asserting the dharmakāya as permanent without asserting that it is something which exists, like the Hindu notion of self.

The problem as I see is that you take literally that which should be understood to be intentional or provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

the poor research comment was in reference to reading like chapter 5 and saying the Lanka only teaches that Buddha nature is skillfull means even when the passage he is quoting doesnt actually say that..... while not knowing that chapter 6 says Buddha nature IS Buddhahood and the highest teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Really? Give me a citation and I will compare it with the Tibetan text -- then we will see.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

nether the less they were posted....and they were your work.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, which I stand by and which despite your persistent effort, you did not refute.

You merely demonstrated that you have a specific way of interpreting these texts. You did not succeed in showing that your approach is the "right one" (tm).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

you actually refuted yourself seeing as you started off with how the Buddha Nature is only a potential....then you started providing passges that stated Buddha Nature was the Dharmakaya,totally undermining your own position to begin with.

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmakāya (emptiness) can be a potential. The problem with you is that you can only see things one way.

Son of Buddha said:

Since the ultimate nonmenon that is beyond dependent arising is never non existent,

when one realises this, one does not fall to an extreme of non existence and is released from the extreme of deprecation.

Malcolm wrote:

And thus, since you advocate a "never nonexistent ultimate", you fall into the extreme of eternalism, and since you advocate a never existent relative, you fall into the extreme of annihilationism.

In other words, you, like the Gelugpas, get on one side of the horse only to fall off the other side -- the funny thing is that when you are falling off one side, the Gelugpas are falling off the other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

...you do realise that Malcolm's comments are a jumbled mess, half of his quotes are not even relevant to the actual topic, and many of his passages he claims to support his position don't even have anything to do with his claims, also the vast majority of the work is poorly researched...

smcj said:

I don't think that's a fair assessment of Malcolm. He knows what he is talking about. He has worked hard and has some level of expertise. He has his take on things, which I often disagree with, but his ideas are always well thought out, and within the parameters of a well-established buddhist perspective. He doesn't easily allow for other well-established perspectives, but if he did this entire site would be much more boring.

I disagree with him a lot of the time. Then again sometimes I agree with him. And sometimes (OMG!) I even learn from him. But I never dismiss him.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhaputra also forgets that I did not post those citations, LB did, from a post that I wrote on E-Sangha nearly ten years ago. So of course they are out of context. No one asked me if I thought they were relevant to the present discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Buddha Nature isn't a potential for Enlightenment,

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is exactly that; just as the potential for butter exists in milk, so too the potential for awakening exist in sentient beings. That potential is called "tathāgatagarbha". When that potential is "churned:" by practice, the result emerges just as butter emerges from milk. But if you examine milk before it has been churned you certainly will not find butter there. Likewise, if you examine sentient beings for buddha qualities you also will not find them, even though since they will arise through practice we can consider them naturally complete at the time of the cause.

Anyway, I am not sure why you are upset at being termed "eternalist" since that is exactly what your beliefs are, i.e., eternalist. You believe in the existence of something that is permanent as well as primeval.

Son of Buddha said:

The Buddha Nature/3rd turning Teachings are considered the definite teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not by everyone, for example, me.

Secondly, you use outdated, inaccurate translations [Suzuki, etc.], and while Hodges translation of the Nirvana sutra is fine, even Hodge admits that that long Nirvana sutra flatly contradicts itself, a fact which he attributes to textual interpolation by the translator of the longest version.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

A person of superior faculties could understand dzogchen fully with only a very few pith phrases, and thus a minimal of hermeneutical interpolation. I don't see how the absence of presence of historical errors of dzogchen hermeneutics might impact his understanding of dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen, (apart from being a realization) essentially became hermeneutic criticism after the Tibetans invented the scheme of the nine Yānas in order to explain Dzogchen's relationship to the other strands of Buddhist theory.

Frankly, I think very few people understand Dzogchen based on a few pithy phrases, lord knows I certainly didn't and don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, there was no Tibetan dark age. Langdarma was murdered in 841 in reaction to his taxation of the monasteries. This caused the Tibetan empire to fragment. Because of the ensuing dispute over succession.

But a dark age like Europe? Not at all. Buddhism was wide spread among aristocratic families like the Khon, the lCe, and so on. They preserved these teachings. Masters like Nubs Sang rgyas Ye shes were active and continued to translate and travel to India.

Then there was the western Tibetan Buddhist "revival", usually dated to the time of Rinchen Zangpo's return from Kashmir, in the late 10th century.

Sherlock said:

This sounds like how some people say there was no real dark age in Europe after the fall of the Western Roman Empire. Christianity survived and prospered during the Dark Age there as well, but in "mundane" standards, there was quite a big difference. There was a huge decline in artistic works, in the economy and international trade, in overall order; temples, including Samye, fell into disrepair, I think that qualifies as a dark age.

Malcolm wrote:

You make it sound like Tibetan culture and civilization came to a grinding halt. I suppose, from the point of view that grants Tibet a culture and civilization only in relationship to a recently imported foreign religion, that might be true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?

Content:

Indrajala said:

But then maybe decentralized models of mostly lay practitioners and a minority sangha is a plausible course of action as well.

Sherlock said:

That's how Buddhism survived in Tibet during the Dark Ages.

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, there was no Tibetan dark age. Langdarma was murdered in 841 in reaction to his taxation of the monasteries. This caused the Tibetan empire to fragment. Because of the ensuing dispute over succession.

But a dark age like Europe? Not at all. Buddhism was wide spread among aristocratic families like the Khon, the lCe, and so on. They preserved these teachings. Masters like

Nubs Sang rgyas Ye shes were active and continued to translate and travel to India.

Then there was the western Tibetan Buddhist "revival", usually dated to the time of Rinchen Zangpo's return from Kashmir, in the late 10th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

So essentially Malcolm just accused the Buddha of being a realist, eternalist, and having some type of wrong view.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. I merely stated that there are those who understand such statements to affirm some kind of transcendent existent absolute, and that those who have such an interpretation have not understood the Buddha's teachings correctly.

The passage you cite merely states there is a state of bondage and a state of liberation. It does not state that liberation exists without the context of bondage. In fact, it predicates liberation on the fact of bondage.

It really does not say anything more than nirvana means freedom from rebirth.

The only reason you are using a Pali canon citation is that you know that Mahāyāna sūtras are not defensible as historical records of the Buddha.

Instead of giving citations, you should exercise your intellect, which is much better than becoming an expert in this or that species of dogmatics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 19th, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Imperial China...

Malcolm wrote:

Warlords and petty kings, as I said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?

Content:

Indrajala said:

But then maybe decentralized models of mostly lay practitioners and a minority sangha is a plausible course of action as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you can always hope for serious social fragmentation that will inevitably result in warlords and petty kings again, and then you can once again have your state-supported and sanctioned "Buddhism" (and you can expel some "bonpos" for good measure).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

In fact what in my statement do you even disagree with?

"I assert that the True Self/Buddha Nature(which is Enlightenment) is not-born, not-brought-to-being, not-made, and is unconditioned."

Malcolm wrote:

If you think this ultimately exists, then your assertion is realist and eternalist.

smcj said:

Ok, then so what? If you're not doing practices where that becomes an issue, then what's the harm? One can always change their mind later. Personally I'd rather say "ultimately valid" or "ultimately authentic", but that's just me playing with words.

Malcolm wrote:

That becomes an issue in all Buddhist practice, because it is an extreme view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Chenresig Jenang initiation by HHDL Italy 2014

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

For that matter, is the Dalai Lama considered Chenrezig because that's the so-called "patron deity of Tibet"?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is because in a political move, the regent of the great fifth, one of the all time great

scholar scoundrals in Tibetan History, Desri Sangye Gyatso, decided to promote the great fifth as such, and the appellation has stuck every since.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

In fact what in my statement do you even disagree with?

"I assert that the True Self/Buddha Nature(which is Enlightenment) is not-born, not-brought-to-being, not-made, and is unconditioned."

Malcolm wrote:

If you think this ultimately exists, then your assertion is realist and eternalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

Anders said:

Shouldn't that more properly be something like 'Dzogchen hermeneutical development' than just plain 'Dzogchen'?

Malcolm wrote:

How can the two be differentiated?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Fa Dao said:

is there not another possibility besides those two..Dzogchen of Indian origin or Dzogchen as a Tibetan invention? Didnt Dzogchen come from Garab Dorje originally and wasnt he said to be from Oddiyana? And didnt Oddiyana have its own separate language, culture etc apart from India?

Malcolm wrote:

Oḍḍiyāna is not part of modern India, but was considered by Tibetans to be part of rgya

gar. Its language was related to Sanskrit but was not Sanskrit, like Hindi, Gujarati, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Lindama said:

Malcolm: it is Dzogchen, because it really does express the religious genius of Tibetans in both its Bonpo and Buddhism forms. There is nothing like it at all in Indian Buddhism, or any other form of Buddhism.

Are you including zen in "any other form of Buddhism" (that is nothing like dzogchen). I have nothing to defend, just wondering.

Malcolm wrote:

\

Absolutely. While comparisons made be made, Zen and Dzogchen are dissimilar despite repeated attempts by some to liken them to on another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing like it at all in Indian Buddhism, or any other form of Buddhism.

Sherab Dorje said:

Uuuuummm... Mahamudra?

Malcolm wrote:

No, mahāmudra is its own thing. I have read a lot of Indian mahāmudra literature, and while certainly comparisons may be made, Atiyoga is just different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

... just because Malcolm says so doesn't make it so either I am afraid.

Malcolm wrote:

Why is it important to you that these texts are translations?

I mean, do you really care about the source of these texts?

If these texts are for the most part native Tibetan compositions, does that make them less profound and interesting?

The funny thing about both Tibetan Buddhism and Bon is the evident fetish for foreign teachings.

If anything has a right to call itself Tibetan Buddhism, it is Dzogchen, because it really does express the religious genius of a group of Tibetans in both its Bonpo and Buddhism forms. There is nothing like it at all in Indian Buddhism, or any other form of Buddhism. I also happen to think that Dzogchen is the most profound expression of Buddhist praxis so far. That is why I have spent most of my adult life focused on its teachings.

On the other hand I personally find that treating most (but not necessarily all) of these texts as native compositions solves many problems and answers many questions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Wang, Lung & Tri: the Trifecta

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

This dawned on me when I read the interviews in the first few pages of Judith Hanson's translation of *The Torch of Certainty*:

What role does the guru play in guiding an individual through practice of the Four Foundations before, during, and after completion of the practices? What is the nature of the guru-disciple relationship?

TRUNGPA RINPOCHE: (...) Commitment to your guru and his teachings is very necessary; it gives you some guidelines for your life. Without that commitment you might begin to make up your own version of the Dharma, your own edition of the teachings, and sooner or later what you will get back is just your own ego version of the teachings. So the idea of commitment here is total surrendering, complete surrendering. You don't edit your own version of the Dharma anymore.

Thankfully I have found a guru whose instructions my egoic mind is willing to totally submit to, and the path has been made clear. That said, perhaps this thread may provide some help or guidance, bringing benefit to others. This was the intent.

supermaxv said:

Good points. I do find that far too many people on the internet are trying to "edit their own version of the Dharma" when it comes to vajrayana, but I deeply sympathize with those who wish to follow the path but don't have access to a guru and teachings.

I let my egoic mind get out of control earlier this year after receiving a deity initiation from a high Sakya lama (just the wang) that didn't have an associated practice text to go

along with it (besides the short daily prayer sheet that was handed out), and I was intensely googling and bugging the lamas and monastery about if there was a more complete sadhana available for study / practice to no avail. It didn't make sense to me, why would there be an empowerment (and it wasn't an obscure one) without a practice sadhana?!? A few weeks ago I randomly found a copy at the monastery store and eagerly snatched it up before I realized that it was (a) really long, (b) really complex, (c) not a daily practice , and (d) a returned copy with some confused notes scribbled in the margins from someone who was probably in my exact state of mind a few weeks earlier.

I took a deep breath and realized I still have a lot of ego to cut through. Since then my motivation and daily practice has intensified almost exponentially.

Malcolm wrote:

IN Sakya, the lung for the practice is generally considered to be included with the empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism for King and Country?

Content:

Sherlock said:

The survival of Buddhist practices during the Tibetan Dark Ages and more recently during the Communist revolutions throughout Asia might offer lessons as to how Buddhism can survive without state support.

Malcolm wrote:

But it didn't survive without state the support. The support system for Tibetan Buddhism, the aristocracy, fled to India.

it's revival in China held Tibet was also supported by state apparatus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since Tibetans like Jlgme Lingpa consider the whole of Dzogchen literature as a monolithic textual edifice imported from India rather than a gradual discourse among the developed in Tibet beginning in the early ninth century, they tend to assert dogmatically formulations which derive from man ngag sde and apply them rather indiscriminately. We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

heart said:

First I think you have to be able to prove your thesis about the Tibetan origin of the 17 tantras Malcolm, no? Just because you say so is no proof.

/magnus

Pero said:

Question I have is, where is the proof they are of Indian or other origin? Seems to me either way you go it will be hard to definitely prove anything, unless they find the original texts.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no proof that they are, which is the reason why they were excluded from the bKa' 'gyur. Even though the kun byed rgyal po is included, most scholars, even Tibetans, today accept it is a later compilation.

Anyway, why does it matter? I personally reject the view that they are translations from an Indic language because there are clear reasons to reject that view.

By and large, no one anymore believes Mahāyāna sutras were taught by the Buddha and there are many good reasons to reject that belief. Frankly, my point of view is that imagining Indic origins for the Dzogchen tantras inhibits our ability to understand them.

The problem is that people conflate the issue of origin with the issue of value. For me, the origin of these texts is not what grants them value; but the schemes people have elaborated to understand on the basis of their origin are no more effective than believing that scheme of the three turnings of the wheel grants us definitive insight in the meaning of Buddhist teachings.

What grants these texts value for me is the various ways they describe the process of delusion and how to wake up from that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since Tibetans like Jigme Lingpa consider the whole of Dzogchen literature as a monolithic textual edifice imported from India rather than a gradual discourse among the developed in Tibet beginning in the early ninth century, they tend to assert dogmatically formulations which derive from man ngag sde and apply them rather indiscriminately. We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

heart said:

First I think you have to be able to prove your thesis about the Tibetan origin of the 17 tantras Malcolm, no? Just because you say so is no proof.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You are entitled to believe whatever you like. I will continue to analyze Dzogchen tantras as a product of gradual textual evolution since that is what makes the most sense to me based on my reading of the texts.

BTW, just because you say the Bible isn't the true word of GOD, doesn't make it so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since Tibetans like Jigme Lingpa consider the whole of Dzogchen literature as a monolithic textual edifice imported from India rather than a gradual discourse among the developed in Tibet beginning in the early ninth century, they tend to assert dogmatically formulations which derive from man ngag sde and apply them rather indiscriminately. We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

Pero said:

Uhm why? Wouldn't that mean that Tibetans didn't understand Dzogchen fully?

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on what one means by "understand fully". What I mean is understanding the currents that are clearly obvious in Dzogchen tantras that have specific opponents in mind and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

"Those who, not understanding this, mistake the ālaya for the dharmakāya, are like blind men wandering in the desert without a guide. Because of their confusion about the vital points of the basis and result, they have come to a standstill on the path that accomplishes buddhahood in one lifetime."

- Jigme Lingpa

Malcolm wrote:

The only reason I brought up the distinction was because Dante made reference to the gzhi snang concept. Had he advanced the bodhicitta gambit, the discussion would have taken a different turn.

It is my opinion that the gzhi vs. kun gzhi distinction was elaborated by the early man nag sde school as a sort of a pull back from the earlier, and more radical use of bodhicitta as kun gzhi in the bodhicitta texts.

Since Tibetans like Jlgme Lingpa consider the whole of Dzogchen literature as a monolithic textual edifice imported from India rather than a gradual discourse among the developed in Tibet beginning in the early ninth century, they tend to assert dogmatically formulations which derive from man ngag sde and apply them rather indiscriminately. We should be careful not to do the same. Otherwise, we will never understand Dzogchen fully.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

hmmm somebody introduced a

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red_herring

how did we drive off a cliff and end up in the Great Vegetarian Debate thread???

Malcolm wrote:

All threads lead to the Great Vegetarian Debate. This the most gripping controversy in Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

haha now you're conflating threads. anyway, I said that various cognitions lead to different experiences: cognizing yourself killing a cow (or having someone do it for you) and eating it will lead to a cognition in a future life of you being killed and eaten by someone else. cognizing yourself eating a potato leads to rebirth in most excellent Buddha fields where young girls will tend to your every need.

Malcolm wrote:

The cognition of eating a potato actually leads to endless births as potato bugs being killed again and again by organic pesticides...

gad rgyangs said:

no because karmic intent to commit & satisfaction over killing only happens eating steak, not potatoes.

Malcolm wrote:

nonsense. you clearly ignore the consequences to life and the environment of your dietary choices. By doing so, since you approve of all the lethal choices farmers make in producing your food, ergo, you are also culpable, karmically as well as morally.

In samsara, there is no free lunch, whoever much you wish to rationalize one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

a nice story, until the concept of delusion intruded again as a value judgment.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a problem with your deluded preference for potatoes over steak being deluded? After all, they are both just the basis. Case closed, from a Dzogchen point of view, if we follow your reasoning, Veganism is bullshit.

gad rgyangs said:

haha now you're conflating threads. anyway, I said that various cognitions lead to different experiences: cognizing yourself killing a cow (or having someone do it for you) and eating it will lead to a cognition in a future life of you being killed and eaten by someone else. cognizing yourself eating a potato leads to rebirth in most excellent Buddha fields where young girls will tend to your every need.

Malcolm wrote:

The cognition of eating a potato actually leads to endless births as potato bugs being killed again and again by organic pesticides...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

In order to see the basis as it is, rather than the deluded superimposition (samaropa) we normally perceive, we have to uproot the all-basis, the so called ālaya.

this is causal as prak.

Malcolm wrote:

It is also Dzogchen theory. You don't have to accept it, but that is how it is explained in the Dzogchen tantras, sNying thig and so on.

gad rgyangs said:

a nice story, until the concept of delusion intruded again as a value judgment.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a problem with your deluded preference for potatoes over steak being deluded? After all, they are both just the basis. Case closed, from a Dzogchen point of view, if we follow your reasoning, Veganism is bullshit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Apology to women

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the things some guys will do to try and get laid

Nighthawk said:

Is it wrong to be male feminist?

Malcolm wrote:

Quite a number of feminists seem to think so. "Male feminism" can be seen as a patriarchal appropriation of a subaltern narrative.

It's probably better to consider yourself "anti-patriarchal", or a "pro-feminist" man than a "male feminist".

Actually, the apology to women (AKA Manifesto of Conscious Men) is one the most sexist things I have seen in a long time, which is why it was rightfully spoofed by Will Farrell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 18th, 2013 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

But this picture is fundamentally dualistic to begin with, because it starts with a separation of the consciousness that is or is not recognizing from that which is or is not recognized. If this separation is removed, then dualism vanishes of itself, and its called Dzogchen. This state is not created by recognition, is not lost by non-recognition: it is always already the case.

Malcolm wrote:

The interesting feature of Dzogchen is not the basis. The interesting feature of Dzogchen is its explanation of delusion.

You can keep claiming potatoes are the basis I (no need to even call them "appearances of the basis") until the cows come home. This does not help one to understand the process of delusion at all. Fundamentally, Dzogchen teachings serve to explain the process of delusion and how to unravel it.

I agree with you that the basis not improved by recognition or rendered defective by non-recognition. I also agree with you that delusion never stirs from the state of the basis itself. However, this does not mean that cognition of a potato is a cognition of the basis. It is a cognition of the all-basis.

The cognition of conventional things is produced by consciousnesses impregnated with traces of delusion without beginning. The intellectual apprehension that delusion never stirs from the basis is still just an intellectual apprehension that does nothing in terms of unraveling the fundamental delusion the produces deluded experience in the first place.

This is why for example, it is clearly stated in various places that gazing at rocks and trees for example will not lead one to experience the body of light because unlike the wisdom appearances of the four visions, the vision of rocks and trees are karmic visions supported on traces of affliction and action, i.e. the dualism of deluded vision itself.

In order to see the basis as it is, rather than the deluded superimposition (samaropa) we normally perceive, we have to uproot the all-basis, the so called ālaya.

Incidentally, in the account of the appearance of the basis it is pretty clearly stated that the appearance of the basis is perceived with sense organs that arise from the basis along with the neutral awareness that stirs from the potentiality [rtsal] of the basis.

That primordial dualism [the connate ignorance, lhan cig skye ma rig pa] collapses when that neutral awareness recognizes the appearance of the basis as its own state; but when it does not, the imputing ignorance takes the name of the all-basis, producing all of our conventional, and therefore, innately deluded experience.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"false" is an arbitrary label. I'll save us some time:

"superimposed by who?"

"by you, me or anyone"

"and where did we come from? are we not also appearances of the basis, call them false or true?"

"or course, otherwise we and so-called "false" appearances would have a different basis than the basis of true appearances. And there are not multiple bases."

"so really, both so-called "false" or "marigpaed" appearances and so-called "true" or "rigpaed" appearances have one and the same basis, and are therefore both appearances of that basis?"

"or course, there is no other possibility."

Malcolm wrote:

Snake [false appearance of the all-basis], rope [appearance of the basis].

On the other hand without the appearance of the basis there is also no basis for deluded appearances, so I can see why you are confused. This is the principle reason why the man ngag sde school elaborated a gzhi and a kun gzhi to account for how it is that deluded appearances are not the appearance of the basis (which cannot itself give rise to deluded appearances), while demonstrating that deluded, i.e., conventional, (i.e. the false) appearances of everyday things are rooted in the nonrecognition of the basis.

In the bodhicitta texts no differentiation is made between gzhi and kun gzhi, since the concept of the appearance of the basis was not yet formulated.

If potatoes are the appearance of the basis, there is no need for the elaboration of the all-basis to account for deluded appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Veridical means seeing the actual nature of a given phenomena. Surely you are not eating an ultimate potato.

It is taken for granted in the Madhyamaka view that conventional cognitions are also deluded cognitions. Nevertheless, some deluded cognitions are efficient, hence Nāgārjuna's admonition to rely in the conventional in order to realize the ultimate.

gad rgyangs said:

since this thread is in Dzogchen, I will say that the potato, as an expression of the gzhi snang (rigpa-ed or marigpa-ed) is as ultimate as anything. As you know, the emptiness of the potato cannot be separated from the potato (reified) so where else will one find an ultimate except the potato itself? The other choice, which I am equally at peace with, is there is no ultimate anything, since ultimate requires a contrasting non-ultimate, and what would that be, given gcig pu?

Malcolm wrote:

The potato is not an appearance of the basis, it a false appearance [snang lugs] superimposed on the appearance of the basis. And indeed, there is no ultimate to find apart from the real nature [gnas lugs] of the potato.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas

Content:

Aemilius said:

Madam Blavatsky, who has been mentioned here, concretely experienced how the social order Religion and the social order of Science behave when they encountered her paranormal powers and capacities.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, she did not take kindly to being found out as a fraudulent con artist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: Ancient Buddhas

Content:

tatpurusa said:

Back on topic:

According to Bon tradition, the founder of Bon, Buddha Tonpa Shenrab Miwoche, was born about 18000 years ago, and had a lifespan of thousands of years.

Living Bonpo masters, like Yongdzin Tenzin Namdak, do interpret these numbers literally.

Malcolm wrote:

There is not simply one tradition about this. It is like the Nyingmapa traditions around Padmasambhava. Not every account (i.e. the earlier accounts) has him appearing in a lotus blossom. Some accounts even portray him as having a human father and mother.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ok so you are defining "absolute truth" as a cognition or mental state of an ordinary being?

Malcolm wrote:

If your cognition is absolutely veridical, it is not longer ordinary, no?

gad rgyangs said:

depends on how you define "veridical": if I recognize the baked potato I am eating right now as a baked potato, that is veridical in a conventional sense. If I shift to rigpa for an instant, then that is veridical as long as it lasts, but then I am back with my potato. last night when I dreamt that my grandmother was a bus, that was veridical at the time too, and all of these plus \$2.50 will get you on the subway.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but as you know that is not what veridical means. Veridical means seeing the actual nature of a given phenomena. Surely you are not eating an ultimate potato.

It is taken for granted in the Madhyamaka view that conventional cognitions are also deluded cognitions. Nevertheless, some deluded cognitions are efficient, hence Nāgārjuna's admonition to rely in the conventional in order to realize the ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

who's cognition?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh god, we are not going to play this silly little Zen game are we?

Your cognition of course, any given subjects cognition.

gad rgyangs said:

ok so you are defining "absolute truth" as a cognition or mental state of an ordinary being?

Malcolm wrote:

If your cognition is absolutely veridical, it is not longer ordinary, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Apology to women

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Totally creepy.

<http://www.funnyordie.com/videos/55c51f0c23/dear-woman>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:52 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

By 'the mind which seeks to reject views' I meant a mind which deprecates the idea of views altogether and therefore would attempt to abstain from expressing views.

Malcolm wrote:

All that is required for this is the famed non-affirming negation.

A negation does not necessarily the negator holds a view of his or her own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

who's cognition?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh god, we are not going to play this silly little Zen game are we?

Your cognition of course, any given subjects cognition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Everything that is NOT Nirvana falls into the category of Anatta.

<http://www.tbcm.org.my/mn-64-mahamalunkya-sutta-the-greater-discourse-to-malunkyaputta/>

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize this statement is pure dualism through and through?

Son of Buddha said:

Well Malcolm I am quoting from the Pali Canon which is generally considered by both True Self and Not Self Theravadans to be Dualistic in material.

http://www.accesstoinsight.org/lib/authors/bodhi/bps-essay_27.html

Here is an essay by a (Not Self Theravadin) well known Ven Bodhi on what the Pali canon teaches about non duality.

I could look up a True Self Theravadans perspective on non duality if you like?
(Shouldn't be too hard to find the largest Buddhist sect in Thailand is a True Self Theravadin sect)

But you would also consider their material "dualist" also

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, your view, the view of Theravada in general, etc. are all pretty much mired in trenchant dualisms of various kinds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimate truth is a cognition

gad rgyangs said:

a cognition is a mental state. how could that ever be ultimate truth?

Malcolm wrote:

An ultimate truth is an absolutely veridical cognition. That is its definition. If you want to fight the definition, but then you are basically in humpty dumpty land.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Everything that is NOT Nirvana falls into the category of Anatta.

<http://www.tbcm.org.my/mn-64-mahamalunkya-sutta-the-greater-discourse-to-malunkyaputta/>

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize this statement is pure dualism through and through?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

24.10 simply acknowledges that common speech (vyavahāra) must be used to talk about the ultimate truth that there is no ultimate truth

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimate truth is a cognition, not an external fact.

The purpose of 24.10 is to show that the conventional must be relied upon in order to realize the ultimate. It is incorrect to say there is no ultimate truth. If you say there is no ultimate truth you are effectively saying that all minds are always deluded at all times, even the mind that apprehends the non-existence of ultimate truth which you suppose is the ultimate truth.

In other words, by disallowing veridical cognition, you are automatically consigning yourself to a state of permanent unalleviable delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 17th, 2013 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Garchen giving Refuge Vows webcast

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

does refuge vow mean the 5 lay vow's?

heart said:

No, that is a separate ceremony.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Refuge indeed confers the five lay vows, but magnus is also correct in that there is a separate pratimoksha ordination which is classified as Hinayāna, usually given to those who plan on becoming monks or nuns. In general, when Tibetan lamas give refuge, they are doing so from a Mahāyāna system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

Go tell an Advaitan that cit is conditioned by certain factors of mentality (nama) and materiality (rupa), dependent on contact to give rise to the 6 sense media and to practice by being mindful of the arising and passing of each. You will either get a confused look, be laughed at or both.

dzogchungpa said:

I believe they would accept all of that with regards to citta.

Malcolm wrote:

But not cit. That was the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana views on dying and intermediate state

Content:

Luke said:

Just about everyone has heard about the Tibetan Book of the Dead by now, but what do standard Mahayana schools think happens during death and the intermediate state?

Are there any sutras which explain these things from the Mahayana point of view?

I would like to understand how the Tibetan beliefs differ from standard Mahayana ones.

Malcolm wrote:

One, there isn't a single Tibetan system regarding the antarabhāva, or intermediate state, there are several, most derived from Indian sources.

Second, there is not much difference, other than Mahāyāna provides no methods regarding how to practice in such a state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 16th, 2013 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Prayers for the victims of false flags

Content:

prayerwheel said:

Also there's a warning about South Flower and West Fifth Avenue in Los Angeles being the target of a false flag op, so avoid it for a while maybe?

Jikan said:

Got a source on this?

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3y-0dHFvkV4>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Garchen giving Ratna Lingpa's Vajrakilaya

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

oh, thanks, but its not that short. its just as long as the ratna lingpa's version.

i was hoping more like max 20 pages with starting and finishing prayers. anyway, thanks for pointing the sadhana out.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you include and exclude.

The main practice is 11-33, which is more or less exactly the length you said you wanted.

For daily practice you can skip lots of elaboration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Garchen giving Ratna Lingpa's Vajrakilaya

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

it would seem from the header of that scribd text that it is not the same sadhana as the one on theyre webstore...

Malcolm wrote:

This is the one.

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/149130531/Puja-Vajrakilaya-Sadhana-Ratna-Lingpa>

It is actually Sangye Lingpa's sadhana, employed as a short practice for the Ratling tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The tetralemma is used in all kinds of ways by Nāgārjuna. But each use has a context.

gad rgyangs said:

didn't answer the question: name a context where the tetralemma would not apply.

Malcolm wrote:

Which tetralemma? N uses several.

gad rgyangs said:

let me restate why i am bringing this up in this thread: if, as N says in 27.30, Buddha "taught the true Dharma for the abandonment of all views", then, two questions:

1 why is it necessary to carefully distinguish the views of Buddhism and Vedanta, if they both must be abandoned anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

24.10

gad rgyangs said:

2 if the "true Dharma" is not a view, then what is it?

Malcolm wrote:

The intent of teaching dependent origination and emptiness is the elimination of views. Which views? Views of existence and non-existence, and that's all.

FYI, your query has nothing to do with the subject of the thread. The thread has actually gone off topic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

lelopa said:
afaik the next one will be adzom drugpa

Malcolm wrote:
The Padmasambhava and Adzom transmissions are identical in every respect apart from the date.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 9:36 PM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
Anders said:
Shankhara's assesment of Nagarjuna for example is that he was basically correct in his analysis, except that he does not allow for an existent unconditioned element.

Malcolm wrote:
Cough, cough....

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 9:35 PM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
if you cant say "is", "is not", "both", or "neither", then what exactly can you say?

Malcolm wrote:
The purpose of that passage actually is to eliminate things you can say about the tathāgata — context is everything.

gad rgyangs said:
are you claiming there are other topics not subject to the tetralemma?

Malcolm wrote:
The tetralemma is used in all kinds of ways by Nāgārjuna. But each use has a context.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 7:43 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
all the Buddha's teachings are like the toys on the lawn to get the kids out of the burning house.

Jikan said:

This is, itself, a teaching of the Buddha. Is it also provisional?

Not in the context in which it is put forward. In the Lotus Sutra, where this analogy is developed, it describes the means by which the Buddha deploys provisional teachings as a means to get to the absolute teachings (the Buddha-vehicle). Are the teachings that are characterized as "absolute" themselves merely provisional, merely upaya? Is the concept of upaya itself provisional?

Malcolm wrote:

It's upaya all the way down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if you cant say "is", "is not", "both", or "neither", then what exactly can you say?

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose of that passage actually is to eliminate things you can say about the tathāgata — context is everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ummm, 22.11:

"we do not assert 'empty'
nor do we assert 'nonempty'
we neither assert both nor neither.
they are asserted only for the purpose of designation"

Malcolm wrote:

see 24.17-19

Dependent origination is not the "provisional" teaching of the Buddha. Otherwise, Nāgārjuna would not have introduced MMK with the mangalam praising dependent origination, free from ceasing, arising and so on as the pacification of proliferation.

Is there something more definitive in the Buddha's teaching than the pacification of proliferation? According to you it is all about relinquishing views. When there is no proliferation, how can there be a view?

gad rgyangs said:

all the Buddha's teachings are like the toys on the lawn to get the kids out of the burning house.

Malcolm wrote:

So you basically think all the Buddhas teachings then are "provisional". Ok. I don't agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ummm, 22.11:

"we do not assert 'empty'

nor do we assert 'nonempty'

we neither assert both nor neither.

they are asserted only for the purpose of designation"

Malcolm wrote:

see 24.17-19

Dependent origination is not the "provisional" teaching of the Buddha. Otherwise, Nāgārjuna would not have introduced MMK with the mangalam praising dependent origination, free from ceasing, arising and so on as the pacification of proliferation.

Is there something more definitive in the Buddha's teaching than the pacification of proliferation? According to you it is all about relinquishing views. When there is no proliferation, how can there be a view?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Jikan said:

Is dependent origination a view, or is it adequate knowledge, first hand, of how samsara works?

gad rgyangs said:

how does "first hand" knowledge of dependent origination look different from causation, which is negated in MMK 1?

both "empty" and "dependent origination" (which are really the same thing) are provisional/arbitrary teachings of the Buddha (according to MMK)

Malcolm wrote:
Ummm, no.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 4:11 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
doesn't it say somewhere something about "relinquishing all views"?

Malcolm wrote:
Well, there is the intellectual "giving up of views" and then there is realizing the nature of dependent origination which is free from views.

gad rgyangs said:
"dependent origination" is also a view.

Malcolm wrote:
You can make anything into an intellectual trip.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 12:52 AM
Title: Re: Garchen giving Ratna Lingpa's Vajrakilaya
Content:

heart said:
Ok thanks, you know of any translation?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Sure, there is a translation used the Palyul folks. This is the main Kilaya tradition of Palyul.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 12:11 AM
Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
doesn't it say somewhere something about "relinquishing all views"?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is the intellectual "giving up of views" and then there is realizing the nature of dependent origination which is free from views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 15th, 2013 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really buy into the integral models of world spirituality.

Anders said:

Practically or fundamentally? Practically speaking, I could be inclined to agree. But doesn't karma more or less dictate that spirituality is fundamentally integral?

Jikan said:

the word "integral" means many different things. Would you mind explaining what you mean by the term for the purpose of this discussion?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I had in mind the the attempt by various modern perennialists to come up with models that allows absolute equivalencies to be made and hierarchies to be established among various spiritual traditions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The question here is whether or not the cessation of rebirth is effected by seeing dependent origination or by seeing an ontological totality. Take your pick and run with it. But you cannot pick both because they are mutually exclusive views.

Anders said:

I get that, but this still revolves around a 'view of the ultimate' model of liberation. If we take a 'shred of affliction' model as early Buddhism does (I think the former is really mostly useful for determining how practically useful a model is) for our measurement, it comes out to 'no-thing at all to hang a shred of clinging to' vs 'a few ontological shreds of clinging of a mostly purified mind'. Ie, cessation of rebirth is not so much effected by 'seeing dependent origination' as it is by 'ending clinging to views of self' and so forth (from which the perception of dependent origination is produced).

I am understating it here for dramatic effect and all and I do appreciate that the

expected view of liberation seems to have a strong effect on the eventual outcome for its successful practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

Any shred of clinging is sufficient to sink your battleship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

Maybe a few (very) crude diagrams will illustrate the difference I am talking about:

Where 'catholicism' would fall under the umbrella of those who do good creating good karma to increase the odds of meeting with the dharma of liberation, etc.

More or less the difference I suppose between the Ekayana view of Arhats, who will continue towards buddhahood so long as they do not fall into the view of personal nirvana and the 'seed of bodhi' model, where the fruit of the Arhat is fundamentally and irreversibly distinct from the fruit of Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really buy into the integral models of world spirituality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

"two distinct schools with two entirely distinct results."

Malcolm wrote:

They are two distinct schools with entirely distinct results because they have entirely different bases.

Anders said:

Do elaborate.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is predicated on dependent origination and emptiness, Advaita refutes both

dependent origination and emptiness. The difference, as always, is view.

If you confine your notion of liberation to controlling afflictions, there there is no difference at all between all the various ethical systems which recommend self-control in conjunction with contemplative quietude.

The question here is whether or not the cessation of rebirth is effected by seeing dependent origination or by seeing an ontological totality. Take your pick and run with it. But you cannot pick both because they are mutually exclusive views.

One of the key points of the Dzogchen tradition is understanding all these different tirthika [samsaric] and bauddha [nirvanic] tenet systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

"two distinct schools with two entirely distinct results."

Malcolm wrote:

They are two distinct schools with entirely distinct results because they have entirely different bases.

Dzogchen is predicated on dependent origination and emptiness, Advaita refutes both dependent origination and emptiness.

I am not making any truth claim here for either one. I am merely pointing out that the truth they claim is different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Garchen giving Ratna Lingpa's Vajrakilaya

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Do you know if what he gives now was perhaps in danger of going extinct, and thus Rinpoche began to propagate it? Or do you think perhaps this is the safest Kilaya sadhana for the Western students of his to practice?

heart said:

I don't think this particular terma is in any danger of going extinct. I don't know what you mean with "safest", Vajrakilaya is not dangerous in any way, my guess is that there is a comfortable short sadhana that fit the mentality of westerners in this cycle as well as a translation. I am sure there exist several sadhanas of various length in this cycle, there normally is.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Usually people use the short Kilaya sadhana of Sangye Lingpa in conjunction with this tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

Come now. It's a lot like Brahman, which is why they are so often compared.

Malcolm wrote:

No, brahman is sat, real, where as dharmakāya is the total realization of emptiness free from all extremes and its attendant twin omniscience.

In other words dharmakāya needs a realization to bring it about. Brahman does not.

Anders said:

Unless we talk of Samantabhadra who never fell into ignorance and so forth.

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are making a huge mistake. Samantabhadra does experience ignorance, i.e., the ignorance identical with the cause, and the connate ignorance. What "he" never experiences is the imputing ignorance, thus Samantabhadra never experiences samsara.

Samantabhadra also experiences liberation; doing so without gathering virtue; just as sentient beings experience bondage without gathering nonvirtue.

Please study Dzogchen more carefully. Even rdzogs chen tantras themselves differentiate Dzogchen from Advaita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

Come now. It's a lot like Brahman, which is why they are so often compared.

Malcolm wrote:

No, brahman is sat, real, where as dharmakāya is the total realization of emptiness free

from all extremes and its attendant twin omniscience.

In other words dharmakāya needs a realization to bring it about. Brahman does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

Unknown said:

1) According to Malcolm, KTGR had to concede in a debate with him in the end that Shentong is no different from Advaita except its emphasis on Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

I simply pointed out to him that the structure of the gzhan stong presentation of the two truths could not be distinguished from the way Advaita formulates the two truths. He admitted this, but replied that Advaita did not have buddhahood and that was the difference between the two. In other words for him, the structural similarities in the formulations were of less consequence than differences in the notions of total liberation between the two systems.

But lets not extend the consequences of answer to far. He was not admitting for example, that there is only one universal cit, and so on, as in Advaita.

There is also the fact that idea of bodhicitta and so on is utterly lacking in tīrthika systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Peter Brown and Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

im reading a book called Dzogchen Primer. and it takes the stance that even Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche taught the traditional path and method of dzogchen. that is to progress through the nine yanas.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not how TUR taught Dzogchen, at least not according to people I know who were personal long term disciples of his. TUR, as I understand it, taught Dzogchen based on the individual person. Some people were taught more gradually, other people less.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 14th, 2013 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Acharya Mahayogi Sridhar Rana Rinpoche

Content:

elpz said:

Hi. Came across this quite by accident, and created an account just to reply to this.

As a student of his I can assure you that Rana Rinpoche is definitely not a Sakyapa. His first Vajrayana teacher was Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche and while he has strong links to the Sakya tradition -- given that Chobgye Trichen, Sakya Trichen, and Karma Thinley Rinpoches have been his primary teachers since his entering retreat in 96 -- he is quite firm in stating that he is non-sectarian.

Here's our sanga's website for more info on him:

<http://www.byomakusuma.org>

Cheers.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is not his attitude towards schools, the point is who his main teachers are and what he mainly practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 12th, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: 13 books of khenpo shenga

Content:

lama tsewang said:

I want to find translations of all the Thirteen Treatises of Khenpo Shenga together with his commentary, and the ones by Mipham Rinpoche , can any one help me please

Malcolm wrote:

They do not exist yet. The only one out there I know of is the translation of the Dharmadharmatā-vibhanga by the Dharmacakra Translation Committee.

There are only a few commentaries by Mipham out there as well. But all the main texts of the thirteen treatises, the indic originals, do exist in translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 11th, 2013 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

tobes said:

The former wants to preserve some universal truth that everything is one, the latter wants to preserve some particular truth that difference is meaningful and decisive.

Malcolm wrote:

They are both sectarian.

Adamantine said:
How so?

Malcolm wrote:
They both present partial views about reality.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 10:13 PM
Title: Re: Mo Lha, and the 5 foremost dieties
Content:
Adamantine said:
Can anyone elaborate on this and how it relates to Tibetan Medicine, and if there are specific pujas related to these 5? And perhaps the significance of paintings like this one

Malcolm wrote:
These five deities are the deities that live on a person's body and are with him or her from birth. If they leave the body, then there can be illnesses since they have protective role.

They are mentioned among the snang srid de brgyad in the sde brgyad ser skhyem.

Adamantine said:
Thanks Malcolm. Do you know if there is a physiological relationship with their placement in the body? For instance, the Mo Lha being at the left armpit?

How do you view these, as actual entities, or metaphors for something related to our individuality?

Are they generally communicated with during sang puja? There is a concise sang by Dudjom Rinpoche the second line of which reads 'GO WA'I LHA NGA DRA LHA NYEN PO NAM
(You five superior gods and the fiercely protective dralha)
Are these five deities in particular what he is referencing?

Thanks for your insight!

Malcolm wrote:
There is a section of the eight classes that are placed on the body. You can look at the serkhyem of the eight classes and see it quite easily.

And yes, DR is referring to those five gods.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

tobes said:

The former wants to preserve some universal truth that everything is one, the latter wants to preserve some particular truth that difference is meaningful and decisive.

Malcolm wrote:

They are both sectarian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Dechan Jueren and Hanmi Buddhism

Content:

BuddhasNoDieCancer said:

The problem is the discontinuity on the teachings from Dechan Jueren to the other disciples.

Malcolm wrote:

Another problem is that he is dead, passed away in 2011.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 8:14 AM

Title: Re: Mo Lha, and the 5 foremost dieties

Content:

Adamantine said:

Can anyone elaborate on this and how it relates to Tibetan Medicine, and if there are specific pujas related to these 5? And perhaps the significance of paintings like this one

Malcolm wrote:

These five deities are the deities that live on a person's body and are with him or her from birth. If they leave the body, then there can be illnesses since they have protective role.

They are mentioned among the snang srid de brgyad in the sde brgyad ser skhyem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 10th, 2013 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Longchenpa & Dolpopa: Contemporaries

Content:

udawa said:

One connection between the two is Rangjung Dorje, the 3rd Karmapa.

I think I'm right in saying that Rangjung Dorje studied alongside Longchenpa and he met Dolpopa at some point.

D

Malcolm wrote:

Kumararaja 1266 - 1343

Rangjung Dorje 1284 -1339.

Longchenpa 1308 - 1364.

If they had met, I am sure it would have been with Longchenpa being a common monk going to meet a very high Lama. I seriously doubt whether they ever studied together, but they both studied with Kumararaja.

I believe Longchenpa only meets Kumararaja when he is 29, two years prior to the death of the third Karmapa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 9th, 2013 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

rory said:

Okay due to a recent question I do have something to add. I was interested in Amoghapasa Avalokitesvara's mantra and dharani and was answered but another thoughtful person mentioned that a tulku gave this sadhana. Now I'm rather interested but if the thing is in Tibetan then it's a confusing turn-off.

Malcolm wrote:

Amoghapasha's mantra and dharani is given in Sanskrit.

Tibetan texts give the Sanskrit in a much more accurate way than anything in Sino-Japanese Buddhism. This is simply a fact.

If a sadhana is listing things like faces, hands, etc., this should be translated in English and recited in English, irrespective of which tradition it comes from. The only exception would Shomyo chanting, etc., things like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Daesung Sunim

Content:

greentara said:

Astus, It is unusual but not improbable. I gather the book is about self enquiry. Obviously the Zen monk Daesung Sunim, was taken by the clarity and perhaps the technique was easy to follow....hence the distribution to fellow monks.

Malcolm wrote:

I actually ran into this guy last summer in Santa Monica, while having a drink at the bar in Shutters by Beach. He really did not speak any English at all, but he was enthusiastic that we were Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 11:00 AM

Title: Re: new subforum to lounge

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rime just means Sakyas, Kagyus And Gelugpas who practice Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Well, here's the thing.

The thing about marijuana is , um...

uh....okay, okay. You know , like, okay. like, you aren't high, and then you, like, you are high,

and there's like this thing, you know?

and, um...when you ummmmm....

....what were we talking about?

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude! Where's my mala?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 8:56 AM

Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?

Content:

padma norbu said:

All I can tell you is that my main teacher now is Namkhai Norbu and he may not tell all the secret teachings to everybody, but he is teaching pure dzogchen from what I understand, from ZhangZhung ...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no it is from Oddiyāna, for starters. Garab Dorje was from Oddiyāna.

Secondly, while ChNN definitely has criticized smoking herb because it is bad for one's meditation practice, he has also stated that anyone can try anything.

He has also said, as you remark, that you can drink, but you cannot become drunk. If you become drunk, this is a problem.

Your general pov is ok, but you should not spend so much energy conditioning other people.

padma norbu said:

That's true, especially since I really don't care. Initial post was a bit of a joke, subsequent discussion was evolved naturally by responding to accusations and questions. Thanks for your input. Do you have any knowledge about the psychotropics of ancient Vajrayana or whatever?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you are a really stubborn person, then hallucinogens can be administered in order to demonstrate to you that your mind is not a fixed thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 8:53 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

Konchog1 said:

How do we create a meritorious connection?

Malcolm wrote:

Through the four means of conversion, of course:

Generosity

Pleasant speech

Purposeful behavior

Consistency

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?

Content:

padma norbu said:

All I can tell you is that my main teacher now is Namkhai Norbu and he may not tell all the secret teachings to everybody, but he is teaching pure dzogchen from what I understand, from ZhangZhung ...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no it is from Oddiyāna, for starters. Garab Dorje was from Oddiyāna.

Secondly, while ChNN definitely has criticized smoking herb because it is bad for one's meditation practice, he has also stated that anyone can try anything.

He has also said, as you remark, that you can drink, but you cannot become drunk. If you become drunk, this is a problem.

Your general pov is ok, but you should not spend so much energy conditioning other people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

Clarence said:

[

Also, giving to someone creates a karmic debt on the receiver end, so if someone truly has realization, they will fulfill that debt through their realization. Further, giving creates a connection.

Malcolm wrote:

When one is giving, providing one is a Mahāyānī, as I assume most of us here are, one is supposed to offer dana free from the three wheels, i.e., the idea of the gift, the giver, and the recipient. In this case there can be no question of creating a karmic debt, since none is created.

Konchog1 said:

Don't we want to create karmic connections with beings so they become our disciples when we manifest Enlightenment?

Malcolm wrote:

We want to create meritorious connections with beings, of course, but not debts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

why do you offer an entire universe filled with pure lands and buddhas only to your guru but not also to all sentient beings ?

Malcolm wrote:

The guru is the apex of the pure merit field who unites the Buddha, Dharma and Sangha in one.

Sentient beings are the impure merit field. What you offer sentient beings is the wish that they abide in the four immeasurables, i.e. "May all sentient beings always experience happiness, freedom from suffering, joy and equanimity".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

Clarence said:

[

Also, giving to someone creates a karmic debt on the receiver end, so if someone truly has realization, they will fulfill that debt through their realization. Further, giving creates a connection.

Malcolm wrote:

When one is giving, providing one is a Mahāyānī, as I assume most of us here are, one is supposed to offer dana free from the three wheels, i.e., the idea of the gift, the giver, and the recipient. In this case there can be no question of creating a karmic debt, since none is created.

Karmic debts are incurred only if the dana is not provided or received in such a manner. For example, Aryadeva gave his eye to a blind woman, but when she ate his proffered eye rather than using it to restore her sight, Aryadeva winced with regret at the gift. For this reason, it is said, his eye was not restored to him, as it would have been were he free from the three wheels.

Let us hope that however we exercise our generosity, we do so like wish fulfilling gems, effortlessly and without thought.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

well if your only giving something to your guru in one scenario and in other you are giving to all sentient beings, you think about which is more beneficial.

Malcolm wrote:

Mandala offerings are given to one's guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

Clarence said:

You think Mandala offerings are better than giving directly to Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche?

Malcolm wrote:

To whom do you think one is offering a mandala to other than one's root guru? How can a few dollars match the merit of offering infinite world systems and all their enjoyments?

The point I was making is that we upāsakās and upāsikās have other options to generate merit than just giving money to śramaṇeras. I was not saying that one should not do so--merely that one ought not think that this is the best or only way to generate merit.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Legalized Marijuana - will you smoke it?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

For the pot people usually smoke these days, the fifth precept definitely applies lol. I remember when I was young you could smoke a joint and still be able to walk around and function, seems less and less common these days for anyone but real potheads with a tolerance.

There is no real pot equivalent of a glass of red wine anymore lol, it's all pretty ridiculous now. Basically what i'm saying is, unless you purposely go out of your way for it, there is no longer any way to smoke without getting exceptionally intoxicated, unless you have a heavy tolerance..which obviously is a related issue heh.

padma norbu said:

It also breaks samaya of the body as well as the fifth precept.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Meh I dunno, if just inhaling smoke constitutes that...I imagine there's a difference of opinion there, else lots of remedies would also break it.

Malcolm wrote:

Anything taken as medicine will not break the fifth vow. Even monks are allowed alcohol for medicinal reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

lama tsewang said:

how can the beings make merit??

.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many much better ways to gather merit than making cash offerings to monks. For example, mandala offerings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Business enterprises are another option but of course when one mixes dharma with business it can often have disastrous results (I have heard many first-hand accounts), so I'm not sure that is the way to go, though of course it should be looked at.

Malcolm wrote:

But Buddhist monasteries have functioned as business virtually from the beginning...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 8th, 2013 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

lama tsewang said:

are you saying that there are persons who would request that certain rituals etcetera , be done on their behalf , and would not think it appropriate to give an offering?

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying they would never even think about hiring a monk to do such a thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

bryandavis said:

The Dorje Kasung are obviously not an army.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not how they see themselves. Oh yes, sure it is a practice. But I have know many Kasung over the years, including one of the guys who founded them [an ex Green Beret who did several tours in Vietnam], and they definitely conceive themselves as an army, and more importantly, they conceive of themselves as a private security force, which why they were formed in the beginning.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

Alfredo said:

Eventually, some Tibetan center is going to install pews, a pulpit, and an organ. (You know, like the BCA did.)

Or to take another route, maybe they'll hold hands during meditation, while a keyboardist plays soothing mood music, and the lama says things like, "With your feet flat on the floor, relax all the muscles in your body, and surround yourself with love and light..."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in a lot places they already do the Quaker thing, they just sit silently in a room together...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 7th, 2013 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

conebeckham said:

Not the rancid butter...

Malcolm wrote:

It's not rancid, it's aged in airtight leather bags for one year...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

and i dont know what is this cultural aspect of tibetan buddhism? personally i havent labeled anything that i have encountered within the tibetan buddhist tradition as "cultural".

Malcolm wrote:

All kinds of things. Another thing I observed is that we in this culture, whether we were buddhists in pasts lives or not, have no tradition of punya-sambhara, merit accumulation, which is the rational which underlies 90 precedent of Buddhist ritual, irrespective of tradition. Because of this, we do not naturally reach for our wallets when we see monks and nuns. Instead, our model is a fee-for-service.

As I have noted elsewhere, I don't see anytime soon that there is going to be much sustainability in Buddhist organizations in the West.

For example, every school and every tradition and every sub-tradition wants it own space, etc. There is no sharing of space (because of course that requires also that people cooperate). One person shared with me their puzzlement at why one tulku wanted to place a center in a region where there was already a center that belonging to the same exact school and lineage. Or in Drikung, in Lincoln Vt., there are two Drikung Kagyu centers, and there used to be three (in a town of 1200 people). In Boston there were two. There is a huge impetus to build empires.

You have to understand that the model of governance in Buddhism culture is grounded on the model of the cakravartin, the wheel turning emperor whose golden wheel [there are four grades of wheels actually] conquers any land it rolls through peacefully. Well, every Tibetan school turns its leaders into just such emperors, at least on a symbolic level, and this leads to lots of unnecessary competition and a lot of unsustainable development. It also, in the past, has lead to internecine warfare in Tibet.

All of this is totally built into Tibetan culture at this point and as proof, we have the so-called "Kingdom of Shambhala" in Halifax, Nova Scotia, complete with a king and royal family, a court, an army and a grand narrative borrowed from the Kalacakra cycle. All of this, is deeply cultural. Of course we can make the observation that Karma Dorje does and assert that it is based on one's traces, and for us this is true. But it is not a sufficient explanation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.realnews24.com/gray-whale-dies-bringing-us-a-message-with-stomach->

full-of-plastic-trash/

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Do the cultural aspects of TB practice help or hinder us

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am curious as to what you all think. Do you think that the rituals incorporated into so much of the regular expression of Tibetan Buddhism are an inspiration or an obstacle?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends. Recently I was chatting with a lama who was complaining that westerners never make offerings for prayers and so on, while the Chinese and so on do.

He generally feels that it is because of a lack of faith on the part of Westerners. I responded that no, it is not due to a lack of faith, I pointed out that here especially in US where we have a strong tradition of separation of Church and State as well as strong Protestant traditions, that people tended to regard organized religion with suspicion, not because they have no faith, but because they regard organized religion as being corrupted by power and money. Also we have no cultural tradition of hiring priests to come and recite rituals, unless you are Catholic. Basically, what I was pointing out to him that most of this discomfort is grounded in sociological and historical reasons. I suspect that in Tibet, much of the competition revolved around getting people to recite your prayers, not the other guy's.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

SuryaMitra said:

By saying they never took Refuge , I meant they did n` t took the Refuge ceremony.
Thank you very much guys

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, right -- this is not necessary at all.

SuryaMitra said:

And this is something I don` t understand...Why it is not necessary ? I know that for Dzogchen teachings one doesn` t need formal refuge, but what about the tantric teachings and transmissions? Chod, Guru Dragpur, Simhamukha and many others secondary practices ?

I` m just trying to understand , I` m not criticizing here, but my teachers from Karma

Kagyü, Sakya and Nyingma traditions always taught me, that for any tantric practice, taking formal Refuge ceremony is indispensable. So, for instance, when they give initiation, they will always make sure that new people can take Refuge before initiation...So could you please explain that to me ?

Malcolm wrote:

Every initiation has a refuge ceremony, as well as a bodhisattva vow ceremony built right into it. So it is completely unnecessary to insist that people take refuge and bodhisattva vows according to their respective systems of conferring vows. It simply isn't necessary.

Their attitude come from the traditional Buddhist custom of "cutting the hair". For them, it marks one's serious commitment to the path -- this is why these kinds of traditional teachers are likely to insist that one has to have had a formal and separate refuge ceremony. Even so, it is not necessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Icelanders and their elves.

Content:

Indrajala said:

It is interesting to see the remnants of polytheism playing a role in environmentalism, small as it may be.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you kidding? Virtually all of the indigenous and traditional people around the world who are involved in environmental movements are doing so also out of concern for non-human beings which we would call spirits, etc. It definitely should be a key point in any Buddhist environmentalist platform.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 6th, 2013 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Is spiritual progress worth it?

Content:

logank9 said:

I just want to know beyond a shadow of a doubt it is. Because it just doesn't make sense to me why everyone wouldn't follow it. If it is the end all be all to highest happiness why isn't everyone spiritually improving themselves all the time?

Malcolm wrote:

Some people are not spiritual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 5th, 2013 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

dharmagoat said:

And our junk will continue to make great homes for all those little critters.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously?

dharmagoat said:

On reflection, no. Not the plastic junk.

Malcolm wrote:

Phew...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

dharmagoat said:

And our junk will continue to make great homes for all those little critters.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously?

"Besides the particles' danger to wildlife, on the microscopic level the floating debris can absorb organic pollutants from seawater, including PCBs, DDT, and PAHs.[32] Aside from toxic effects,[33] when ingested, some of these are mistaken by the endocrine system as estradiol, causing hormone disruption in the affected animal.[30] These toxin-containing plastic pieces are also eaten by jellyfish, which are then eaten by larger fish."

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Pacific_garbage_patch#Effect_on_wildlife

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

montana said:

All the tantric lineages begin with the transmission from the deity to a guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they all begin with a transmission from the Sambhogakāya to a mahāsiddha, or in certain cases, like Virupa, from a Nirmanakāya to a mahāsiddha.

montana said:

How does a Buddha deity differ from Nirmanakaya and Sambhogakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are our gurus. Not the methods they provide us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

montana said:

All the tantric lineages begin with the transmission from the deity to a guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they all begin with a transmission from the Sambhogakāya to a mahāsiddha, or in certain cases, like Virupa, from a Nirmanakāya to a mahāsiddha.

montana said:

How does a Buddha deity differ from Nirmanakaya and Sambhogakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are our gurus. Not the methods they provide us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Namthar are certainly a source of generating devotion, if not the doctrine itself. Many of the most eminent masters have said that reading namthar is critical to remaining inspired while traversing the path.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with this is when we discover that the Namthars we are supposed to rely on are merely pious fictions that deeply contradict the earliest accounts of this or that

master -- Milarepa comes to mind here.

Karma Jinpa said:

Are they 100% historically accurate? Likely not. But they do represent how the lineage has come to see their forebears, and the lessons that can be learned from how they lived, having appeared (whether as ordinary or extraordinary beings).

Malcolm wrote:

Or they represent an author with an agenda which may not be so obvious on the surface.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Namthar are certainly a source of generating devotion, if not the doctrine itself. Many of the most eminent masters have said that reading namthar is critical to remaining inspired while traversing the path.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with this is when we discover that the Namthars we are supposed to rely on are merely pious fictions that deeply contradict the earliest accounts of this or that master -- Milarepa comes to mind here.

Karma Jinpa said:

Are they 100% historically accurate? Likely not. But they do represent how the lineage has come to see their forebears, and the lessons that can be learned from how they lived, having appeared (whether as ordinary or extraordinary beings).

Malcolm wrote:

Or they represent an author with an agenda which may not be so obvious on the surface.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

montana said:

All the tantric lineages begin with the transmission from the deity to a guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they all begin with a transmission from the Sambhogakāya to a mahāsiddha, or in certain cases, like Virupa, from a Nirmanakāya to a mahāsiddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Everybody speaks about samaya, but nobody knows what it

Content:

montana said:

All the tantric lineages begin with the transmission from the deity to a guru.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they all begin with a transmission from the Sambhogakāya to a mahāsiddha, or in certain cases, like Virupa, from a Nirmanakāya to a mahāsiddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 4th, 2013 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

SuryaMitra said:

By saying they never took Refuge , I meant they did n` t took the Refuge ceremony.

Thank you very much guys

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, right -- this is not necessary at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 3rd, 2013 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that's it. They are garlic, chives, leeks, onions, and asafoetida. Whatever the heck "asafoetida" is I have no idea! [/quote]

Asafoetida is a spice also called Hing, used in Indian cooking and in Ayurveda and Tibetan medicine for controlling wind diseases. It is generally used by Brahmins as a substitute for Garlic. It is very pungent smelling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 3rd, 2013 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Climate Change: We're Doomed

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.theherald.com.au/story/1848433/the-ocean-is-broken/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 3rd, 2013 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

SuryaMitra said:

Hi, I received teachings from ChNN, but I know very little about DC, so thank for this post.

During the retreat I spoke with some people, and they told me they never take Refuge.

Malcolm wrote:

That means they do not understand ChNN's teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 2nd, 2013 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Ganapuja and the animal

Content:

max123 said:

how does practicing Ganapuja helps the dead animal that the meat belonged to if the animal has taken rebirth already?i do not know how long it takes for an animal to take rebirth but i'm wondering if it has already before a lot of the meat is eaten(maybe i am wrong i haven't practiced Ganapuja yet and i truly don't know much about it(and how old the meat is etc)but if the animal has taken rebirth would it still benefit?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer lies in the term "rtsal" or "energy, power"; we are connected through this energy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 1st, 2013 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Acharya Mahayogi Sridhar Rana Rinpoche

Content:

philji said:

Does anyone know anything about this teacher?

He is a nepali who was formally practicing Hinduism and then took to Buddhism. I believe his teachers include Tulku Ugyen Rinpoche. He speaks very strongly and clearly about the differences between hindu and buddhist dharma. i would just like to know if he is considered a legitimate teacher within the Nyingma tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

He is a Sakyapa actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 31st, 2013 at 4:13 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Simon E. said:

Of course. But the corporal form of those animals is all around you in the supermarket. It is too late to create a link by being involved in its living.

Sherab Dorje said:

So I say prayers for the liberation of the dead animals. I don't have to eat them to form a connection with them. Saying prayers for the liberation of their consciousness is making a connection with them in their next life (via their death in this life).

seeker242 said:

Yes, what is the reason for having to eat the flesh of a being in order to help it? Prayer isn't good enough? We don't eat the flesh of human beings in order to help those who have passed on, so why does it need to be done for animals?

Malcolm wrote:

You are misunderstanding a key point -- you have to consecrate all of your food because of all the sentient beings who died in its production, not merely meat, but every grain of rice you eat caused the death of something from field to table.

It is a global principle.

You can imagine you are "pure" because you are not eating meat, but you are not. You can imagine you are "compassionate" because you are not eating meat, but if you have no method to help all the beings who are connected to you through debt incurred through eating food, again, your compassion is "miserable", meaning lacking in depth.

Also "praying" for animals is fine, but a little useless since animals pass through the bardo very rapidly, you need another way to connect with them, another way of creating dependency.

Humans can understand humans when they are in the bardo, therefore, reciting prayers and texts like Bardo Thödröl can be very effective. Even here however, this is really only useful a) for practitioners b) must be recited in language the deceased will understand. There are other prayers that are useful for non-practitioners.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: The shapes of the sense faculties

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the actual sense organs exist as patches of atoms on the back of the respective physical structure which have various shapes.

dzogchungpa said:

So, are you saying that there is, e.g., a crescent moon shaped patch on the back of the tongue that serves as the actual organ of taste, at least according to abhidharma?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, precisely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I am not rationalizing their behaviour. I am saying that when the examples you cite are on the level of HHDL or Tsongkhapa, the burden is on you to show that this applies to the average practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

It applies to anyone who is literate and still has a pulse.

At least they are acquiring teachings, as opposed to building collections of stamps and so on. There is no downside.

Receiving teachings you are not able to practice out of acquisitiveness merely leaves an imprint of acquisitiveness and craving associated with Dharma teachings.

Better to have a craving for Dharma teachings than crack or tobacco.

Receiving teachings you are not ready for, can lead one to develop all sorts of wrong conceptuality about the teachings that could be avoided by relying on the care of a realized master and following his or her prescription.

Average practitioners cannot tell if their teachers are realized. The average teacher generally is only interested in promoting their own teaching lineage.

And what kinds of wrong conceptuality are we worried about here? Why the conservatism? Especially coming from someone who hardly fits a conventional definition of a Tibetan Buddhist since by your own admission you continue to practice Hinduism?

In any event, I think it is important for people to study and receive a lot of things, rather than get stuck in these Tibetan lineage politics. Even if they spend some time in a state of confusion, life is short, teachings are rare, and deciding not to go to a teaching because "it might be bad for me" is really false thinking. If you are interested in tummo, go find a tummo teacher. If you are interested in Dzogchen, go find a Dzogchen teacher.

Teachers really cannot discern your capacity unless they have known you for years.

Of course, once you have perceived the essence of all teachings, then going to teachers is a waste of time unless you have a very specific reason for wanting this or that teaching.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So do I.

Malcolm wrote:

Your story misses the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Both are cases of well-established advanced practitioners making an informed decision on how to best benefit others.

Malcolm wrote:

You can rationalize their behavior however you want. There are countless other examples of the same phenomena in Tibetan biographies. My point is that there is no genuine "standard" or "tradition" upon which your sentiments are based.

Karma Dorje said:

For the average practitioner the same approach can easily end up in students acquiring teachings as if they were a stamp collection, rather than taking it as a medicine to cure sickness.

Malcolm wrote:

At least they are acquiring teachings, as opposed to building collections of stamps and so on. There is no downside.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 30th, 2013 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I tend to think the "creating a link" argument is rather weak, especially when you can consider that you can create a link by saving an animal too.

Malcolm wrote:

I try to do both i.e. create a link for the living and the dead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 29th, 2013 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

You suggested that if one approaches one's guru and he declines to give you a particular transmission that you should just ignore him and go get it from someone else. This only really applies if you do not have a close relationship with your teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not really the case.

And in fact we can see from history that for example, Tsongkhapa wanted to receive Kalackra, and his guru, Rendawa, discouraged him from receiving those teachings.

We also see this today with the present Dalai Lama, who was heavily discouraged by his gurus from making a connection with Nyingmapa teachings he was interested in the sixties.

What we observe is that people's manner of receiving teachings in Tibet does not fit a settled pattern.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 29th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

This is your particular perspective and not at all normative for the tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

It was and is totally normative for those people in Tibet who were able to read and had wide access to books. It is a story often repeated, for example, Longchenpa sees and reads books from the Vima Nyinthig before he finds Kumaraja and asks him for the transmission. There are many other examples from Tibetan history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 29th, 2013 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: The shapes of the sense faculties

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I am reading "Gateway to Knowledge" by Mipham, volume 1, and on p.17 I came across the following: The [shape of the] eye faculty is similar to [the round and blue shape of] the umaka [sesame/cumin] flower; the ear faculty is similar to [the shape of] a twisted roll of birch bark; the nose faculty is similar to [the shape of] parallel copper needles; the tongue faculty is similar to [the shape of] a crescent moon disc; and the body faculty is [all-covering] similar to the skin of the smooth-to-the-touch bird.

I have to admit, this doesn't make much sense to me. Can anyone explain this to me?

Here's the Tibetan:

mig gi dbang po zar ma'i me tog lta bu/ rna ba'i dbang po gro ga'i 'jor bu gcus pa lta bu/
sna'i dbang po zangs kyi mo khab gshibs pa lta bu/ lce'i dbang po zla ba bkas pa lta bu/
lus kyi dbang po bya reg na 'jam gyi pags pa lta bu'o

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the actual sense organs exist as patches of atoms on the back of the respective physical structure which have various shapes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 28th, 2013 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Insisting on receiving instructions damages samaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, you should read anything that interests you. If you want to practice, go get the transmission from a Lama you like. If he does not want to give it, then go ask someone else you like.

There is never any samaya damage from wanting to practice Dharma!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 27th, 2013 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

porpoise said:

Not even if there is a full range of non-meat alternatives available at the supermarket,

and the person is making a clear choice to choose the meat product?

Malcolm wrote:

Not even if there is a full range of non-meat products in the market and the person is making a choice to buy meat. Since there is no sentience in a piece of meat, there is no ethical harm in eating meat that one has not killed or has had killed for oneself. In order for one to have the karma of killing on one's hands, one has to do the deed or order someone else to do it, etc. That is, unless one has Mahāyāna obligation to not eat meat, and that is a different issue altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not responsible for the act of killing someone else performs unless I directly pay or ask them to do it.

porpoise said:

So what if somebody orders a Christmas / Thanksgiving turkey from their local turkey farm?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. In this case the action will bear a _karmic_ consequence.

porpoise said:

And what if another person buys their turkey from a selection at the local supermarket? Would you argue that doesn't involve direct responsibility?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. I would argue that there is no _karmic_ consequence for the latter as opposed to the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Good points indeed! What a lot of people don't realize though is how inefficient modern day animal agriculture really is. For example, it takes 4,000-18,000 gallons of water to make ONE hamburger! Meanwhile a pound of corn takes 110 gallons.

Malcolm wrote:

This is true only of feedlot beef. Cows should not be fed corn, since they can't digest it.

seeker242 said:

I wonder what % of the worlds beef is grain fed and what % is true pasture only, grass eating animals?

Malcolm wrote:

Worldwide, 9 percent is grass fed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

porpoise said:

Yes, I do believe we culpable for these indirect actions. If we decide to buy meat then there are consequences. I can't see the relevance of the rest of your post.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if we decide to buy meat there are indeed consequences. If we decide not to buy meat there are also consequences.

However, these consequences are not karmic consequences. I am not responsible for the act of killing someone else performs unless I directly pay or ask them to do it.

"Karma is volition, and what proceeds from volition."

-- Buddha

I am however in a position to take some responsibility for the sources from which I obtain my food. The consequences of eating industrially produced agricultural products is something I don't like, so I avoid unsustainably produced food as much as I can. I personally try to grow food every year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

That still does not deal with the objection: why does the animal have to die?

Malcolm wrote:

It was their karma to die in such a horrible way.

Thrasymachus said:

Further:

If these Vajrayana people are so powerful...

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the people, it is the method.

Thrasymachus said:

If there is a source, why can't you quote it?

Malcolm wrote:

"Those with compassion eat meat."

-- Hevajra tantra.

This is once again another case of using the worse behavior of others to excuse exercising personal agency over what you can control. It is not impressive that you use the excuse of vegetarians not doing everything, so you can personally be more comfortable about doing nothing.

I am not using any excuse at all. I am simply observing facts. The fact is that people will never stop using animals for food. As long as they do so, there will always be a plentiful supply of meat to be consumed. It is really just that simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Good points indeed! What a lot of people don't realize though is how inefficient modern day animal agriculture really is. For example, it takes 4,000-18,000 gallons of water to make ONE hamburger! Meanwhile a pound of corn takes 110 gallons.

Malcolm wrote:

This is true only of feedlot beef. Cows should not be fed corn, since they can't digest it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Our nation throws away an astonishing amount of food everyday, to the tune of 40%-50% of all the food we produce.

IN 2011, 1.3 billion tons of food was discarded. This represents a third of global food production. The amount of food wasted per US citizen is 240 lbs per year.

Rather than worrying about who is eating what, we ought to turn our attention to who is wasting what.

And lets not get started on FOG (fats, oils and greases) that pollute our waterways.

M

Jikan said:

And here there are consequences that anyone with compassion would do well to reflect on: wasting food means wasting water, with consequences for wildlife and habitats; wasting food means accelerated erosion, fertilizer pollution, soil depletion, air pollution from harvest processing and transport, with consequences for wildlife; food production means the production of greenhouse gases, hence every wasted food item means a hotter planet to no purpose, with consequences for wildlife...

Adi said:

These seem to me excellent points, something everyone can participate in -- the "who is wasting what" and the consequences of all that waste. Instead of proscribing that everyone must eat one way or another, pay attention to what is wasted and to increased efficiencies by not wasting so much food. A middle way of sorts that leaves no one out.

On a personal note, I knew there was a lot of wasting of food in the US as I've worked in the past as a waiter and in catering. But 1.3 billion tons of food wasted in 2011? I had to go look that up. For those interested in the full report Global Food Loses and Food Waste (apologies if it was already posted in the preceding 130+ pages) by the UN group, it is here:

<http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/mb060e/mb060e00.pdf>

Adi

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, most of the food produced in the world is grains and vegetables, which also represents vast majority of food wasted per annum. The amount of meat wasted is quite low by comparison (see chart on page four, chapter two).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 26th, 2013 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

ClearblueSky said:

Factory farming is still much, much crueller to animals. By a lot. And if you want to bring up the environment, there is no comparison. Factory farming of cows is the number one cause of global warming. 15% of global warming is due to it, that's more than all the cars on earth.

And I still don't get that logic. Just because it's happening anyway, doesn't mean we have to participate. Sorry to keep referencing my previous post, but I only see how that works if people apply the same to other industries:

There was a point in time where slavery was thought to be inevitable and worldwide. Do you think the people had no karmic consequences if they bought slaves that were already captured, not by their request?

What about with the recent revealing of Seaworld's cruelty. If someone knows what they do to those whales, but still pays seaworld money to go watch them, is that okay because they have the assumption it won't ever change?

If someone explains that those are the same as eating meat, then I would understand. It's really only the separation, people saying one is okay karmically and not the other that I still don't really understand.

Malcolm wrote:

Owning a person is different than eating a the flesh of a dead animal.

One can eat meat without participating in industrial agriculture.

There are two issues in your post:

1. Ethics of eating meat
2. The karmic consequences of eating meat.

The Buddhist ethical positions have been laid out already. The majority of people who are opposing the issue of eating meat are not doing so on the basis of a strictly Buddhist position.

As for karma, karma requires intention, an object, the deed, and satisfaction that the deed was done.

No Buddhist who eats meat will satisfy the criteria for creating a perfect karma of killing. No Buddhist is happy that animals are killed for food. We all regret it.

Even if we refuse to buy meat, still animals will be killed for food. The production of organic food on a national and global scale requires the animal husbandry industry, especially for poultry litter, feather meal, bone meal, blood meal and other such organic fertilizers.

But this issue goes way beyond what Buddhists may or may not do,

A friend of mine whose father runs the largest organic produce farm in Bakersville, CA., was heard to remark that there is not enough chicken shit to produce organic food on a national scale.

Frankly, the real problem is the majority of people who live in cities who do not participate in the production of their own food, people who have no idea how their food is grown, where, and so on.

Our nation throws away an astonishing amount of food everyday, to the tune of 40%-50% of all the food we produce.

IN 2011, 1.3 billion tons of food was discarded. This represents a third of global food production. The amount of food wasted per US citizen is 240 lbs per year.

Rather than worrying about who is eating what, we ought to turn our attention to who is wasting what.

And let's not get started on FOG (fats, oils and greases) that pollute our waterways.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

...cannibals...

dzogchungpa said:

So you, gad rgyangs, see no difference between humans and animals?

gad rgyangs said:

in terms of suffering, no

Malcolm wrote:

There is a huge difference -- animals suffer much more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But when you buy meat in a market, you are not engaging in that karma. There is no intention to kill, as you very well know.

porpoise said:

The intention is to eat meat. The consequences are that you expect somebody else to kill on your behalf, and you expect somebody else to do a job that a Buddhist wouldn't do.

Malcolm wrote:

Absolutely wrong. For example, I know of no Buddhist who eats meat who would eat a lobster in a lobster house because they are killed on the spot for the client.

Granted, because of our economy, meat is cheaper and more available than it was a hundred years ago, when people tended to eat meat seasonally. Chicken and pork were more expensive because they depend on grain for feed (cows should not be fed corn for any reason because they cannot digest it properly).

But this has nothing to do with the basic point that in Vajrayāna there is very clearly a tradition, like it or not, of consuming meat, mostly bovine, and combining that with a method to assist the sentient being that was connected with that flesh at one point.

I am not stating you or anyone else has to follow that tradition. But it exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

yes, after you kill them (or, by paying money into the supply chain, having someone else kill them for you)

Malcolm wrote:

You can't really kill a sentient being. All you can do is sever the connection between its mind and body.

But when you buy meat in a market, you are not engaging in that karma. There is no intention to kill, as you very well know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Simon E. said:

In the context of a debate about meat eating which has developed to include the eating of meat in the context of a Vajrayana puja his being or not being a Buddhist is vital in assessing his lack of knowledge of same.

And incidentally your fatuous and nonsensical use of the term 'cannibals' renders your willingness or ability to debate in an objective way doubtful.

gad rgyangs said:

if sentient beings are your brothers and sisters, and yet you happily kill and eat them.....

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot eat a sentient being, you can only its parts of its body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

as if whether he is a Buddhist or not has any bearing on the veracity of his arguments. He has presented links to clear evidence that disproves a major plank in the cannibals' flimsy web of justification: the argument that, since you can't avoid killing entirely, you might as well not worry about it, and that being a vegetarian causes the death of more sentient beings through rice growing than does killing one cow to feed many.

Malcolm wrote:

He has not provided any evidence whatsoever that the majority of the world's nonbuddhists are going to adopt a vegetarian diet anytime soon. Also, his statistics do not show that the rice industry, for example, depends on chicken litter and feather meal. His statistics ignore the fact that animal inputs are required in any sort of sustainable agriculture, at minimum manure. They ignore the fact of the millions of creatures destroyed by standard organic agriculture, not to mention industrial agriculture.

gad rgyangs said:

I have stated before the simple solution to the ganapuja problem: get the meat for the ganapuja from dumpsters, not supermarkets. And don't discriminate between dumpsters behind restaurants and those behind morgues. Only then can you consider yourself a real tantrika.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is not to be a "real tantrika". The point is aiding sentient beings.

If you are a common Mahāyānist, you should not eat meat at all. If you are a Theravadin you can eat meat. If you are a Vajrayānist, you can eat meat.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

This is just crazy and also speciesist.

Malcolm wrote:

Humans can practice. Animals cannot. We have other methods for creating a positive cause for the eventual liberation of humans who do not practice.

Thrasymachus said:

Is there an actual canonical Buddhist source text that supports this, because you only gave one that supports vegetarianism?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Thrasymachus said:

So who is really being benefited by killing animals due to an addiction to the taste of unhealthy animal products, an addiction and attachment to food, so strong that you are literally killing yourself via diet?

Malcolm wrote:

The production of meat and dairy is deeply embedded into our economy. It will never stop. If you think so you are kidding yourself. Therefore, in Vajrayāna, we have methods to help creatures that are killed as a result of food production.

You may deride them, of course, as you have here. But that just exposes your own narrow-mindedness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Also the Buddha taught in Mahāyāna sutra that we mustn't eat meat.

padma norbu said:

But, did he really? It seems like people believe it was added later by Mahayana buddhists who did not appreciate the meat-eating of Theravadins. Seems pretty odd that by Theravadin texts, the Buddha specifically did not make a rule against it, then with Mahayana he did and then with Vajrayana meat is back again. No sir, I don't buy it.

Malcolm wrote:

Note: I said the Buddha in Mahāyāna sūtras.

Not asking anyone to buy anything. But it is beyond doubt that the Buddha did harshly criticize meat eating in Mahāyāna sūtras.

Whether you accept that Buddha actually taught these sūtras or not is an entirely different question.

Since I consider myself a Mahāyānist, I accept the general message of Mahāyāna.

Since I am a Vajrayānist, I practice according to my understanding of the texts, without being overly concerned about their supposed historical provenance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, sorry if you've talked about this before, but what is the take of Tibetan medicine on meat?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan medicine as well as Ayurveda include meat for those with certain conditions that benefit from meat.

One's diet should be based on one's constitution. One should eat in healthy balanced manner, consistent with the one's health and the customs of the land you live in.

BTW, when Norbu Rinpoche says that being a vegetarian is "miserable" compassion, he is primarily referring to Vajrayāna Buddhists who advocate vegetarianism. Why? Because there are methods in Vajrayāna which assist the animals in question achieve liberation who are connected with the production of our food, whether they are destroyed through pesticides and cultivation or through slaughter. Thus, even if one is a vegetarian one may not justify one's choice not to eat meat through resort of arguments of compassion since one is leaving behind animals who are slaughtered for meat.

He also makes it very clear that the writings on vegetarianism by Shabkar and so on are

direct towards common people who are not real Vajrayāna practitioners. Since they have no method and no understanding it is much better that they not eat meat. Also the Buddha taught in Mahāyāna sutra that we mustn't eat meat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Jikan said:

Hence, taking his own advice, ChNN had become obese (with exercise he's looking better in recent years) in his efforts to empty samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Norbu Rinpoche became obese primarily because he suffered from a serious illness in the late eighties, then leukemia [now in remission for many years] in 1994. He had both his knees replaced in the late nineties, and was unable to properly exercise. In addition, he was poisoned in Dege, Tibet, which led to metabolic irregularities for his entire life since then. He was very skinny until his early fifties when he started having cascading health issues.

He lost 45 kilos in 2011 [through practicing Chulen and eating a restrictive diet that excluded meat] and has for the most part kept the weight off. He does not really eat that much meat, AFAIK.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 25th, 2013 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

can largely be prevented or even reversed by avoiding the meat he advocates. .

Malcolm wrote:

Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche does not recommend eating meat to everyone. Quite the opposite in fact. What he clearly states is that it is better for everyone who is not a practitioner [of Vajrayāna] to be vegetarian.

This means that he thinks it is better for almost all people in the world to be vegetarians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 24th, 2013 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Just Deserts.

Content:

Simon E. said:

During a current discussion on Dhamma Wheel a Bhikkhu member states that the sentiment ' if a person is murdered they are getting their just deserts ' in terms of vipaka, is " ubiquitous among Theosophically influenced Buddhists and common in the Vajrayana '.

Now I have little interest in what may or may not be ubiquitous among Theosophists , but what of his statement that it is a view commonly held in the Vajrayana..what do YOU think ?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, in Tibetan Buddhism justice is an idea associated with karma, dating back to the idea of Yamarāja weighing people's negative karma while sorting out the dead.

If a person is murdered, it is assumed the causes and conditions for their being murdered were laid down in the past by their own actions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

smcj said:

One does not need to reject rebirth to reject the corrupt system of the recognition of reincarnations.

Do you object to the corruption, or to the recognition?

Malcolm wrote:

Both, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

smcj said:

The politics of the tulku system revolves around power first, and money second.

The 8 worldly dharmas are corrupting influences on dharma organizations and personalities, to be sure. However if one believes in reincarnation, and believes that advanced practitioners actually do return, then it seems like throwing the baby out with the bath water to dismiss the phenomena as simply corrupt or even invalid. Better perhaps to find a way to minimize the economic, political, and social benefits so that the level of b.s. is reduced as much as is possible.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not need to reject rebirth to reject the corrupt system of the recognition of reincarnations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

smcj said:

It means that people, westerners, who invest their time and energy into study and practice will be recognized as incarnations after they demonstrated results of practice. There is currently in place a system for upgrading a lama's status to "rinpoche" that is, at least in theory, based on merit, without the designation of tulku being attached. The fact that there has been extreme inflationary pressure for various titles (how many "His Holinesses" are there now?), which cheapens the credibility of the entire system of titles, is a sad and seemingly unavoidable comment on our times.

In terms of tulkus there is the functional consideration of choosing which person to put on the fast-track of practice, including possible material support and access to teachers, so some choice should be made early on. Actual public recognition should wait until if and when the results of the practices are stabilized, probably no earlier than the candidate's mid-30s. That should cut down on the percentage of embarrassing train wrecks.

But that's not going to happen. Nobody is in charge to make those types of decisions. The situation will evolve however it will.

Malcolm wrote:

That system of titles comes from UN protocol for the Vatican. It should be abandoned.

The politics of the tulku system revolves around power first, and money second.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 23rd, 2013 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

smcj said:

But I would argue against the usefulness of an acting school that currently has actors in training deemed "future academy award winners", no matter how good their acting was in their previous life.

Both HHDL and HH Karmapa (Orgyen Thinley brand) were children taken from seemingly random nomad families in eastern Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL was the child of a wealthy land-owning family from Amdo (which had a Kumbum

tulku in it already) about a days' horse ride from Kumbum Monastery. I have personally been to his birth home, seen it with my own eyes. His family was not nomadic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 22nd, 2013 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

Simon E. said:

As you say it has little impact on the vast majority of we westerners apart from any emotional investment we might have made. But if post -mortem recognition becomes the norm that carries implications for the education of such tulkus...doesn't it ?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that people, westerners, who invest their time and energy into study and practice will be recognized as incarnations after they demonstrated results of practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 22nd, 2013 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

Simon E. said:

What's your view Malcolm ?

Malcolm wrote:

My view on the subject is that the terma system and the tulku system both will continue to meet the needs of the client population for these phenomena, mainly Tibetans.

The terma system offers Nyingmapas the assurance that the blessings of their system of teachings never declines and the tulku system in general offers the Tibetan population as a whole, as well as some westerners, the assurance that they will always be guided by buddhas. These are powerful motivations propelling the furtherance of both traditions.

Whether they will be very relevant to us is another question.

We do not have a cultural identity wrapped up in a mythos of a golden imperial era with emanated bodhisattvas benevolently carrying out the duties of an enlightened monarch, working in concert with a foreign wizard and aiding the spread of the dharma, concealing teachings for such times when there are threats to the nation. In general, these are the terms under which termas are concealed and revealed in the Padmasambhava tradition. As a westerner, one has to be educated into these concepts, concepts which are the running background of Tibetan society in general.

As for the tulku system, the tulku system will continue, but I predict that in the West,

most tulku recognitions of practitioners will be post-mortem, as it was before the Karmapas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 22nd, 2013 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Tulkus who have rejected their role

Content:

Jikan said:

I'd thought all tertons are by definition tulkus in the sense that they are emanations or re-embodiments (the precise term escapes me, apologies) of one of Guru Padmasambhava's 25 main disciples. Am I mistaken?

Simon E. said:

Most Tulkus are not Tertons.

To be blunt, the Tulku system arose from a socio/political need. The world has changed.

Malcolm wrote:

The terton system also arises from socio/political needs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

Say, what sexual impropriety was Buddha accused of? I hadn't heard that before.

Malcolm wrote:

He was accused of impregnating a woman. She showed up with a trough under her skirt, accused him of getting her pregnant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

invisiblediamond said:

In Buddhism, good friendships are the meaning of life. Buddhism can be understood as the art of the beautiful relationship.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said there was no meaning to found in the universe. I said the universe was meaningless.

Two entirely different concepts.

For example, a tree can be meaningful for a carpenter, a mouse, a bird, a boring insect or a sculptor, all in different ways. None of the meaning these beings impute on that tree is inherent in that tree. The tree, so far as anyone knows, merely is born, ages, gets sick and dies. By itself, it has no meaning. By ourselves, we have no meaning. We can find meaning, if we want to, but we should not turn that meaning we have found into teleology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. Even Buddha had prejudices and biases. It's very obvious when you read the Pali canon, for example.

Buddha was a human being, he had a human brain, human sense organs and all the limitations of a human body (birth, aging, sickness and death). He was accused of sexual improprieties and all kinds of other faults. He watched his entire clan be murdered and enslaved and did nothing about it (if that does not demonstrate to one that Buddha found life empty of meaning, nothing else will). Rahula was hugely disappointed in him until Rahula decided to follow the Dharma himself.

Poorbitch said:

one more scholars who falls in the darkness of materialism and false assumptions about the buddhas . So predictable

Malcolm wrote:

And your's are TRUE (tm)? Typical fundamentalist remark.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Clarence said:

The question I find interesting is whether or not you believe someone can be realized without having abandoned his prejudices and biases?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. Even Buddha had prejudices and biases. It's very obvious when you read the Pali canon, for example.

Buddha was a human being, he had a human brain, human sense organs and all the

limitations of a human body (birth, aging, sickness and death). He was accused of sexual improprieties and all kinds of other faults. He watched his entire clan be murdered and enslaved and did nothing about it (if that does not demonstrate to one that Buddha found life empty of meaning, nothing else will). Rahula was hugely disappointed in him until Rahula decided to follow the Dharma himself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

They were all Christians and they clearly disliked mahayana and despised vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Which century are you talking about? This is certainly not the case with writers like Davidson and so on.

The notion of the evolution of Mahāyāna Buddhism and then Vajrayāna is based on text critical research.

What is more amusing about your assertion is that classical Indian Buddhist historians of the eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh century take great pains explain why there is a sudden appearance Vajrayāna in India concocting all kinds of wild schemes from Vajrasattva in an iron tower in South India (Amoghavajra and Co in China) to the account of King Dza (Nyingma, but based on Indian antecedents) to the Sakya accounts found in 12th century Presentation of the General Divisions of Tantra, not to mention the earlier and well known account of the recovery of Prajñāpāramita from the Nāgā kingdom under the ocean by Nāgārjuna.

You see, Indians themselves acknowledged from an early period in the common era that Mahāyāna also "suddenly appeared".

Text critical scholars like Davidson, etc., are trying to work out the evolution of these texts because they were pointed to in that direction by what the texts and classical commentaries themselves reveal about the origins of these later canons.

It is just too ungenerous to modern scholars like Gregory Schopen and so on to accuse them of some strange Christian biases.

BTW, the first victim of Christian text critical scholarship was the bible itself.

But text critical scholarship, while not the end all and be all of interpretation of what these texts mean, is very useful in understanding where these texts come from. But sadly, people conflate the two, assuming that if some scholar is correct about say, the Chinese origins of the Heart sutra (Nattier's theory), that therefore, somehow the Heart Sutra becomes less meaningful as a protective charm against non-humans.

The problem is that Western people of a fundamentalist bent shy away from taking text critical scholarship seriously precisely because of our cultural tendency to interpret texts teleologically (which is a Christian, indeed a very western trait inherited from Plato, etc.), a tendency we have deeply inherited from the generally Hegelian theory of history (into which Tibetan narratives predicated on the role of the Imperial period personalities like Padmasambhava and so on play nicely) that we follow.

So when we are confronted with early narratives like that in the 'Bum nag, the sBa bzhed, etc., where Padmasambhava has a human father and mother, we reject these in favor of wildly contradictory later accounts of Padmasambhava's life story because our teachers don't like the idea that Padmasambhava had a human father and mother.

In the end, there are certain Buddhist trends and narratives, especially in Vajrayāna, that play very nicely into our very Western habit of fundamentalism in thought and deed.

This is ironic, because Mahāyāna teachings often completely deconstruct so called Hinayāna teachings, just as Vajrayāna deconstructs the Mahāyāna path and Dzogchen deconstructs Vajrayāna.

We have all these Buddhist teachings deconstructing each other, and yet we have all these Buddhists, both Asian and Western, hell-bent on keeping the whole thing bound together with spit, twine and duct tape. Honestly, it is pretty funny to me.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

I am not really saying that, am I?

Malcolm wrote:

It seems so.

heart said:

I just think it makes sense that, no matter when they were written down, they reflect a teaching taught by the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, probably not in any literal, historical sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point I was making was that making the leap from "Western Buddhologists don't believe Buddha taught Mahāyāna (which is effectively what DKR is talking about) to "This is why I doubt the understanding of seasoned Western practitioners". He making a very specious cultural argument, when all is said and done.

heart said:

I am making exactly the same statement and last time I looked I was a westerner. Not because DKR or anyone else says so but because it makes sense to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I see, so you are asserting you can only understand the meaning of the concept of nonduality in Mahāyāna sutras if you adopt the dualistic standpoint that they were uttered by the historical Buddha sometime about 450-400 years BCE. Right?

If I didn't know you better, I would say that this was a very fundamentalist sentiment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

ReasonAndRhyme said:

Afaik he was also born in Bhutan and is he not also a Bhutanese citizen? But anyway, I just wanted to hint that we all generalize and sometimes overgeneralize.

Malcolm wrote:

The Drukpas (Bhutanese) consider themselves ethnically different than Tibetans, despite sharing a very similar language. DKR's mother is Bhutanese, so I guess you could say he is half Tibetan, half Bhutanese.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

This whole thread has convinced me that DKR is right about the understanding of non-duality of even seasoned Western Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, I have doubts that seasoned Tibetan practitioners, including tulkus, necessarily understand nonduality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think we should feel free to make generalized comments about Tibetan lamas too.

ReasonAndRhyme said:

Especially if they're not Tibetan but Bhutanese

Malcolm wrote:

DKR is Tibetan. He may have been raised in Bhutan, but he is from an ancient aristocratic Tibetan family.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 21st, 2013 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

Malcolm,

I respect you, and I respect your practice. The point here I am trying to make is that when a tibetan lama makes a generalized comment about westerners that there may be a basis for it. What I've just written is my articulation of what I think it is they see but cannot understand. So we can be annoyed by it all we want, but that does not make it go away.

Malcolm wrote:

I think we should feel free to make generalized comments about Tibetan lamas too. There might be a basis too. They might be annoyed, but it will not make it go away.

The point I was making was that making the leap from "Western Buddhologists don't believe Buddha taught Mahāyāna (which is effectively what DKR is talking about) to "This is why I doubt the understanding of seasoned Western practitioners". He making a very specious cultural argument, when all is said and done.

Frankly, I like Popper's idea about non-falsifiability. What DKR does not seem to understand is that non-falsifiability is a completely open-ended heuristic. It does not proclaim anything wrong. It merely addresses the limited range of what ordinary humans can see and creates a category of phenomena which are outside of the range of falsifiability.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Look what I found in Kathmandu...

Content:

Indrajala said:

People will drink their booze regardless of what Buddhism says.

Malcolm wrote:

I certainly shall continue to enjoy wine, regardless of what any Buddhists say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

If there is meaning to life, as I said above, it is only because that meaning is imputed upon it.

This is an existential/nihilistic perspective. The emotional complexities that result from it are what the lamas call "loong", and are a great impediment to the efficacy of our practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry my friend, but this is total nonsense. As doctor of Tibetan Medicine I can assure you that among the many causes of rlung disease, this is not one of them. It is also not an impediment to practice, at least, not to my practice.

smcj said:

Believing we live in a cold merciless meaningless universe where the only meaning is what we impute on it is a fundamentally frightened way to live.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a fearless way to live.

smcj said:

Trying to make things right "on our own terms" is asserting our will in such a way as to be an impediment to receiving blessings.

Malcolm wrote:

"Blessings" don't come from outside. They come from dependent origination and realization. That's about it.

smcj said:

In terms of Dharma practice that fundamental fear is not the problem. It is assumed by Dharma to be the initial operating spiritual principal in the individual. That is why the initial teachings traditionally are about the hell realms, etc. If people have fears, then direct those fears productively and bring them to Dharma. But at some point those fears need to connect to Dharma and need to begin to resolve, which is the stage of "Refuge". Our fears need to begin to be resolved into belief and trust, or as is said more traditionally faith and devotion. At the end of the path there are no more fears, and one of the epithets for buddhahood is "The Great Fearlessness". My late teacher was heard to say, "All fully revealed religions start with fear and end with love. Why? Because fear is the initial spiritual condition of all men, and love the ultimate spiritual condition of all men."

Malcolm wrote:

When we understand there is no meaning then we are at the end of fear. Fear comes from expectations about fulfilling meaning.

smcj said:

In the traditional tibetan culture people feel that they live in a universe where there is a divine justice, and there are loving divinities that are accessible on a functional basis. To them there is an "Ultimate Truth" and people achieve it on a regular basis. This allows them the maximum opportunity to trust and believe, and not be afraid. On the other hand, existential nihilism, coupled with a society in flux, families in disarray, creates frightened people that cannot trust and have no faith. This is the disadvantage we have in our practices. This is what no lama can ever conceive of, since their worldview cannot allow for it. It is our blind spot that we insist not be disturbed because when our own religion collapsed we rejected all religion, not just our religion.

Malcolm wrote:

Ascertaining that the universe has no intrinsic meaning is not existential nihilism.

Personally, I have no use for religion. I do have a use for personal experience.

There has never been any time in history nor has there ever been a culture where societies were not in flux, where families were not in disarray.

The worldview of some lamas do not allow for many things. I am not confined by the worldview of anyone else. Whether I am confined by my own is something you cannot know, but you can certainly judge it if you like.

smcj said:

This is not to say that we have more defilements than a Tibetan. Their anger, greed and such are just as great as ours. It is more like we have a computer virus in our system software that does not allow us to connect properly to the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not suffer from any cultural viruses that cut me off from Dharma.

smcj said:

Protecting our hearts and minds from hurt by being closed makes sense in a merciless universe. Being open is terrifying, as it allows for the hurts to go even deeper. But if our spiritual practice is to be fruitful we need to allow our spirit out so it can grow. If you want to learn to swim you're going to have to get wet. And just about everyone here knows the pitfalls and failings of the modern Dharma scene.

Malcolm wrote:

In reality, the modern Dharma scene is no better and no worse than it was during the time of the Buddha, with one exception, the Buddha, or so we imagine.

smcj said:

But clearly the teachings guide us towards unconditional trust, faith and devotion.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, that is not where my path has lead me. It has lead me to unconditional confidence, knowledge and personal experience. I don't really respond well to the trust, faith and devotion thing.

The Buddha taught that we suffer from birth, aging, sickness and death. He taught us how to escape that condition. Later humans elaborated on the Buddha's message and taught the deeper meaning underlying it (i.e. emptiness of inherent existence). Still other humans later on decided that was too extreme and decided that the deeper meaning needed to be augmented by a somewhat more positive message about our condition, and taught tathāgatagarbha. None of this however renders the universe meaningful.

As I have said many times here and elsewhere. "Life has no meaning, but if you are a Dharma practitioner, then life is meaningful." But this is not a declaration of a teleological (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Teleology>) meaningfulness of the kind you are expressing here. It is also not a declaration of absolute meaningfulness. It is a strictly relative meaningfulness relevant only to humans who can think and judge. It is not a statement about the value of the universe or even the value of a spotted owl. Spotted owls are meaningful to me personally, but they are not ultimately meaningful in anyway.

The universe will perish. Generally speaking we are taught in the Dharma not to impute meaning on the impermanent, the afflicted and identityless. Since even nirvana is identityless, it is a little risky for Dharma practitioners to invest much meaning in it.

The absence of illness is health.

The absence of suffering is bliss.

The absence of meaning is freedom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Indrajala said:

but they are still the words of a buddha, i.e., the sambhogakāya.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not even necessary to say.

They are just words that a human being wrote down on a piece of paper reflecting their vision of the Buddha and that is all they are. Attributing them to the sambhogakāya is also a nice tradition, but it is outside the range of ordinary human perception.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Look what I found in Kathmandu...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing unusual about a shopkeeper in Katmandhu having a picture of HHDL.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Look what I found in Kathmandu...

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

are you serious ? like guns or knives ? who would do that and why ?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Guns, knives, swords, canons, grenades, anything really that is capable of harm.

Who would do? Why all Tibetans. Why would they do it? Because Dharmapālas, like any army, need weapons.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read the Pali suttas.

heart said:

I find them rather boring, to tell you the truth. No wonder that I get excited by the idea of some Mahayana sutras being just as ancient as the Pali suttas.

I practice Dzogchen and so for me the ultimate intention of the nine yanas are simply the realization of the natural state. That is also why they all have great benefit to practice. This point of view is of course ignoring the nine yanas own efforts to posit a ultimate goal and all the polemics that go with that as well as the constantly growing numbers of bodhisattva bumis and so on. In the natural state both samsara and nirvana self-liberate and so Shakyamuni's intention is fulfilled and anyone capable of that are inseparable from him like Garab Dorje, Guru Rinpoche and Vimalamitra. This is also why Shakyamuni is one of the Dzogchen Buddhas.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Pali suttas are rather dry. One of the reasons is that they are NOT literary compositions. They reflect the extemporaneous speech of the Buddha. The themes covered are limited, oft repeated and formulaic.

Let me give an example. You can listen to any DC webcast. I guarantee you that on the first day Norbu Rinpoche will say x, y and z. He often states these things in virtually identical phrases. The Pali canon is like that -- it is an oral record of what the historical Buddha actually said.

Mahāyāna sutras are often quite interesting, because they are literary compositions intended for audiences with specific religious goals in mind. They sometimes emulate repetition, but they are not mnemonically repetitive in same way that Pali suttas are. Thus, they should not be confused with what the historical Buddha said.

The Mahāyāna Buddha is not a historical buddha by any accepted standard of historiography. Chogyal Namkhai Norbu writes on the birth date of sTon pa Shen rab: "...and since history must be studied in congruence with ordinary human perception, I prefer not to base myself on these traditions" (Drung, Deu and Bon, pg. 156). I suggest we should apply no less a rigorous standard to the study of all Buddhist texts and traditions than we do to the study of Bon and other religious traditions, and also judge them in concert with ordinary human perception.

Whatever the Buddha of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna may mean to us personally is not

relevant to what we can know about Mahāyāna sūtras through careful text critical study and archaeological finds and it is better to keep the two separate. I understand that in some people this creates a cognitive dissonance, and they feel they have to choose one or the other. I don't have that problem -- who knows, maybe it is a result of practicing years of creation stage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

What does Dzogchen say about the basis? Malcolm agreed with my teacher when he said, "Not an atom in the universe vibrates that isn't powered by love." Dharma practice isn't trying to find comfort in a cold heartless universe. It is walking the path of fulfilling the potential of the human spirit, which in turn is itself the essence of the universe.

The universe is not a cold mechanistic place, and life is full of meaning. And even an illiterate tibetan villager knows it.

Malcolm wrote:

The universe is a cold place. We seek comfort in our religions, politics, and so on, much like ants seek comfort in ant hills, more or less completely unaware of anything external to their world unless it threatens them.

If there is meaning to life, as I said above, it is only because that meaning is imputed upon it. Even attaining buddhahood is in reality meaningless. Even saving sentient beings is meaningless. If you want it to have meaning, that's ok. But in the end, when we are all dead and buried (within the next 20-60 years) most of us will not even be remembered. We will not remember our past life. We will not remember having decided to follow Buddhadharma. Some of us might no even be human beings anymore.

We are indeed free of teleological meaningfulness. I prefer to leave such concepts to Hegel and his lot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Look what I found in Kathmandu...

Content:

Nemo said:

At least it wasn't a gun store. Black Label you can offer to the Protectors.

Malcolm wrote:

You can offer weapons to protectors too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I must say that I am totally shocked to hear self-described Mahayanists saying that life (including the bodhisattva motivation) has no meaning, and that ceasing to exist entirely (not just within samsara) is the ultimate aim.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not cease to exist (ucchedavada); however with the absence of the cause for arising there is cessation.

Life does not need to have any meaning for a bodhisattva (who understands the meaninglessness of life) to wish to free sentient beings from pointless rounds of samsaric existence. In fact it entirely underpins their whole motivation. They have recognized that there is no meaning to life, and they wish to rescue others from the delusion that life has meaning.

The point of Buddhadharma is to cease having the experience of birth, aging, sickness and death.

As Maitreya Bodhisattva is supposed to have said, there is not even the a needle point of happiness to be found samsara. Birth only occurs because of afflictions. When afflictions are eradicated, birth also ceases.

However, the meaningless of life does not prevent me from enjoying life. I actually rather enjoy it more, since I know that my existence is free from the burden of teleological meaningfulness.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

If you stay in the natural state samsara stops, that is the only cessation the Buddha ever taught.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

That's simple not true, Magnus, it is especially untrue with respect to Dzogchen.

heart said:

We will have to agree to disagree then.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read the Pali suttas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

then you havent studied shantidevas bodhicharyavatara. or other mahayana text's that deal with motivation of life.

Malcolm wrote:

These texts deal with one's motivation for awakening, which is predicated on the fact that life has no intrinsic meaning. Being born, living, dying are all intrinsically meaningless from the perspective of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, completely. The entire teaching of Buddha Dharma is based on meaninglessness of samsara and ending the process of taking rebirth in it. Life = samsara. If samsara is meaningless, so is life. The ultimate desiderata is to bring the whole cycle to an end. Since sentient beings are endless, that will never happen. Nevertheless, the primary goal of Buddhadharma is to achieve a nirvana in which nothing is left behind.

M

heart said:

If you stay in the natural state samsara stops, that is the only cessation the Buddha ever taught.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

That's simple not true, Magnus, it is especially untrue with respect to Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There's nothing abstract about genuine love. It's immediate and obvious. Biological self-perpetuation on the other hand, that's a huge ideological abstraction.

Malcolm wrote:

Love is not a purpose, and does not lend itself to imbuing meaning on a cosmic scale.

Life is only meaningful to those who find meaning in it. Buddha clearly didn't which is why he recommended cessation.

heart said:

? are you serious?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, completely. The entire teaching of Buddha Dharma is based on the meaningless of samsara and ending the process of taking rebirth in it. Life = samsara. If samsara is meaningless, so is life. The ultimate desiderata is to bring the whole cycle to an end. Since sentient beings are endless, that will never happen. Nevertheless, the primary goal of Buddhадharma is to achieve a nirvana in which nothing is left behind.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There's nothing abstract about genuine love. It's immediate and obvious. Biological self-perpetuation on the other hand, that's a huge ideological abstraction.

Malcolm wrote:

Love is not a purpose, and does not lend itself to imbuing meaning on a cosmic scale.

Life is only meaningful to those who find meaning in it. Buddha clearly didn't which is why he recommended cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 20th, 2013 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no intrinsic meaning or purpose to life. That is the essence of understanding samsara. We have to make it enjoyable on our own terms, that is the essence of practicing and realizing the Dharma.

Karma Dorje said:

The intrinsic meaning and purpose of life is to yield ourselves to the service of others.

Malcolm wrote:

That also serves no purpose at all unless you subscribe to some abstract ideological which imputes such values.

But life has no purpose at all, unless you consider biological self-perpetuation a "purpose".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Sherab said:

I thought liberation is due to wisdom

Malcolm wrote:

No, liberation is due to the eradication of afflictions.

I am not sure what you mean by "wisdom". So you mean omniscience? Or do you mean prajñā?

If the former, omniscience is not required for liberation.

If the latter, the prajñā that eradicates the afflictions is exactly the same in an arhat and a buddha.

Sherab said:

Okay, let me try again and see if I can make my trend of thought a little clearer.

I was thinking along the line that the liberation of an arhat is liberation from the 12 links of dependent origination. This is done when any link is cut. That cutting is due to a certain wisdom realized.

Since the wisdom of a buddha is far greater than the wisdom of an arhat, there must be a difference in the realization of a buddha compared to an arhat.

This implies that the wisdom realized by a buddha goes further than just cutting the 12 links of dependent origination. It is the difference in knowledge/wisdom of a buddha compared to an arhat that allows the buddha to perform greater 'miraculous' feats than an arhat. So I thought that the difference would come from the buddha having knowledge of all dependencies and not just those of the 12 links of DO. Via the buddha's knowledge/wisdom of all dependencies, the liberation of the buddha is liberation from all dependencies, in contrast to the liberation of an arhat which is only a liberation from the 12 links of DO.

Malcolm wrote:

Regarding liberation:

If you cut a rope, does it matter much whether the scissors you are using are six inches long or six feet long?

Regarding realization:

There is certainly a difference between a six inch flame and a six foot flame.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Sherab said:

I thought liberation is due to wisdom

Malcolm wrote:

No, liberation is due to the eradication of afflictions.

I am not sure what you mean by "wisdom". So you mean omniscience? Or do you mean prajñā?

If the former, omniscience is not required for liberation.

If the latter, the prajñā that eradicates the afflictions is exactly the same in an arhat and a buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between a Buddha and an arhat in terms of liberation, that is why all buddhas are also arhats; there is a vast difference between a buddha and arhat in terms of qualities.

Sherab said:

So there is no difference in the wisdom of an arhat and the wisdom of a buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a difference between their qualities (wisdom being one of them), but not their liberation, i.e., freedom from rebirth in samsara, which after all is the definition of liberation by all Buddhist traditions, as well as a number of non-Buddhist ones.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Sherab said:

If liberation means

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation simply means being free from the operation of afflictions.

Sherab said:

I thought liberation defined as being free from the operation of affliction refers to being free from the 12 links of dependent origination, i.e. the liberation of an arhat or a pratekyabuddha. In contrast to that, I thought that the liberation of a buddha would be freedom from all dependencies. Otherwise, there would be no difference in realization between a buddha and an arhat.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between a Buddha and an arhat in terms of liberation, that is why all buddhas are also arhats; there is a vast difference between a buddha and arhat in terms of qualities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness and the two truths

Content:

Sherab said:
If liberation means

Malcolm wrote:
Liberation simply means being free from the operation of afflictions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 9:13 PM
Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa
Content:
heart said:

Feel free to point me to your sources Malcolm. After almost 30 years listening to Buddhist teachings I find it very probable the Buddha taught in different ways to different disciples. The fact that they find it difficult to find proof that Hinayana is older than Mahayana is an interesting indication of that.

Malcolm wrote:
You are confusing two different factors: Physical texts with age of a given tradition.

The early Canon was largely oral. We know that by the time of Ashoka texts were starting to be written down.

There is no record of an early reaction to Mahāyāna, as you would suppose there would be, since Ashoka purged the monastic sangha at the encouragement of the Vibhajyavadins. You see reactions towards proto Mahayāna ideas such as multiplicity of Buddhas and so on. But the first solid historical evidence we have of Mahāyāna texts is their translation into Chinese, and now a few fragments from Gandhara which support the idea that Mahāyāna was current in the Gandhara region during the first century.

We have Buddhist texts written on Ashoka pillars that can be pinpointed and have been. We know that the Pali canon was written down in Sri Lanka during at the beginning of the first century BCE. We know that there were multiple canons. We also know that in Mahāyāna sūtras books are mentioned a lot. In the Pali sūtras, books are never mentioned even once. Clearly, the primary difference between the Nikāyas and the Mahāyāna canon is the difference between collection of texts that were recalled orally for centuries prior to being committed to writing to a collection of texts that are a product of a self-conscious literary process of authorship.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:47 PM
Title: Re: Renunciation as path of Sutra: sources?
Content:
David Chapman said:

Chögyal Namhkai Norbu Rinpoche characterizes Sutra as the vehicle whose path is renunciation. This certainly seems accurate to me. However, I've had difficulty finding any other source that says the same. Renunciation is regarded as an aspect of the sutric paths, but nowhere else does it seem to be regarded as the essence or summary.

Are there other, earlier sources that regard renunciation as the essence of the Sutric path? Or is this characterization ChNNR's specific teaching?

Thanks very much for any leads.

David

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakyapas clearly make a distinction between Sūtrayāna, which is a path of giving up sense objects, and Vajrayāna, which is a path of not abandoning sense objects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

The problem with that reasoning is that there is actually no archeological evidence for it. The idea of the evolution of Buddhist spiritual practices isn't based in anything solid, and in fact the Dzogchen teachings for example completely negate this idea. Anyway, we are far away from DKR and Tsongkhapa, probably my fault.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is archeological evidence for it -- the evidence is in the texts themselves, all kinds of evidence -- from the naming of plants and trees, to locations, etc.

The idea of the evolution of Buddhist spiritual practice in Indian history is based on very solid evidence, inscriptions, statues, etc. There is a lot of plastic evidence that tracks the evolution of Mahāyāna into Vajrayāna for example aside from texts.

Irrespective of its historical origins: Mahāyāna is valid on its own terms or it is not. I accept that it is. Bodhicitta is a unique contribution of Mahāyāna to world spiritual traditions. I fully identify as a practitioner of Mahāyāna Dharma. I understand the desire and wish to trace this sūtra or that sūtra back to Shakyamuni Buddha, but I think it is futile.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Many people with entrenched biases are not stupid.

dzogchungpa said:

Yes, and DJKR is not one of them.

Malcolm wrote:

We will agree to disagree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Simon E. said:

But quite a number of indications that the Theravada is a remnant of one ancient and partisan school.

heart said:

Well that is the often repeated mantra, still don't explain why there are Mahayana texts recovered among the oldest know Buddhist texts.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The oldest known, physically surviving Buddhist texts exist on the Ashokan pillars.

The Gandhari texts do not shown an overwhelming concern with Mahāyāna -- they reveal a few fragments of Mahāyāna texts dating to the 1st century CE, but we already know that Mahāyāna was in existence at this time due to the presence of 2nd century translations into Chinese. In order for me to be convinced that Mahāyāna was taught by anyone, let alone the Buddha, prior to the first century BCE, I would need to see some hard physical facts. Luckily for me, my soteriology does not depend on archaeology. Also my estimation of the capacity of Tibetans (or anyone else) to understand nonduality as presented in Buddhist texts does not depend on whether Buddha actually taught "nonduality".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Does that article provide some evidence that Mahayana might have been taught by the Buddha? I looked through it and I didn't see anything like that.

heart said:

It says clearly that the oldest Buddhist texts we have are both Hinayana and Mahayana, as to what the Buddha actually taught is anybody's guess since its early history is hearsay.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It says nothing of their authorship. What the Buddha actually spoke is not really anybody's guess, since there is sufficient evidence to prove that what is taught in the Pali canon/Agamas is more or less directly based on what the Buddha may have actually spoken.

While it is certain that parts of these early teachings have certainly been renovated into sections of Mahāyāna sūtras, the real question is "Did Buddha actually, physically, as a historical reality, teach Mahāyāna sūtras." The answer must be, no he didn't, except in someone's pure vision.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

How many people do you know that believe that there is no intrinsic purpose or meaning to life, and that we just have to make it enjoyable on our own terms? Or how about the opposite? How about the christian fundamentalist that sees the modern world as a threat and must be bullied into conforming to their beliefs?

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, it appears to me that many Tibetan exponents of Buddhism view the modern world as a threat, in much the same way they regard science as a threat.

There is no intrinsic meaning or purpose to life. That is the essence of understanding samsara. We have to make it enjoyable on our own terms, that is the essence of practicing and realizing the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There's no yawning gulf between Tibetans and Westerners, as far as I can see. Same afflictions, same institutional bugbears, same overweening conceits of intellectual prowess...

Malcolm wrote:

It would be nice of Tibetan exponents of Buddhism such as Dzongsar would cease advertising how much more afflicted and so on Westerners are supposed to be. So far as I know, no incarnated Lama has ever been murdered by their own Western students.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Have you been to any of his empowerments?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I have not, precisely because of the kinds of things he says.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I have. I think I am at least as western as you, and I did not get the impression that he does not understand us. Are we really that hard to understand? He's not stupid, you know.

Malcolm wrote:

Many people with entrenched biases are not stupid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

But it seems to take some time to land.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry Magnus, this does not rate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I'm not so sure about that. Have you been to any of his empowerments?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I have not, precisely because of the kinds of things he says.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

It's more that our culture creates chaotic and confused people.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I guess I just can't by into this way of thinking. Most of the people I know are neither chaotic or confused. In fact the most chaotic, the most confused people I have ever met, apart from rock and rollers, were Buddhists in Dharma centers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

heart said:

Actually, Mahayana might have been taught by the Buddha. The archeological proofs are becoming just as solid as for the Hinayana scriptures.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Really, what proof?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

smcj said:

My teacher said to me once, "Our minds look like a wiggling can of worms to them, so they give us the Dharma and hope we can make something out of it."

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but I have met many Tibetans and even Tibetan lamas and teachers, for the most part their minds are just as infected with worms as ours appear to be.

I personally am rather tired of the cultural chauvinism exhibited by Tibetans. It is one thing to be appreciative of one's culture. It is another thing to rest on the laurels of history (actually socio-geographical happenstance) and use this fact to tout the superiority of one's culture.

I don't like it when American politicians waffle on about American "exceptionalism" and I don't like it when Tibetan teachers waffle on about Tibetan exceptionalism. There is nothing particularly exceptional about human beings in general, apart from our capacity to think and reason -- and even that is very questionable when viewed from a cosmic perspective.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

DKR has a bad attitude about westerners. Its a pity really.

dzogchungpa said:

I kind of agree, but he has had a lot of experience with westerners, and seems to be quite appreciative of western culture. Maybe he has a point?

Malcolm wrote:

A point about what? He does not understand us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Alfredo said:

Mandala, I see Tsongkhapa's presentation of Indian Buddhist philosophy (e.g. the division into four tenet systems) as a factual distortion, however fruitful it may have been for Tibetan scholasticism.

Malcolm wrote:

The four tenet system is Indian in origin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 19th, 2013 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar Kyentse Rinpoche brief comment on Je Tsongkhapa

Content:

Alfredo said:

Here's the quote I was thinking of:

[...] I've been talking with a lot of--a few, a few scholars in Oxford. They're very good, really good! Very good. There are many so-called Buddhist professors, or Buddhist experts, and they strongly oppose reincarnation. They don't believe that nonduality is taught by the Buddha, and stuff like that. Very good. It's a very educational for me. [smiles, audience laughs] I would just yesterday talked about--someone I had actually only heard the name, but never really learned anything about...him. Um, Karl...Karl Popper. Karl Popper? So... Also, in Oxford I was told that they're studying Buddhism "objectively." That's very interesting. [smiles, audience laughs] So this is all disorienting for me because [stammers] I had to switch my mind back to the Buddhist mind, so to speak, in order to talk about... this.

Anyway this is very important subject. [long pause] If we don't talk about nonduality, then I don't think we can really talk about Buddhism at all. And nonduality's not so easy. Recently I was talking to...Indians, just Indian intellectuals. And I was even kind of... worried...that how much we Tibetans actually manage to conceive the idea of nonduality thoroughly, as much as these Indians seems to have done. It's not that easy, this nonduality, to really conceive this. Especially if are, you think like, I think, like Karl Popper's way. And if you really think that something can be observed and valued objectively, nonduality's difficult. [shifts on seat] About a year ago I met a professor in America--Berkeley University--and he told me something very interesting. He said actually, it's very important that the Tibetan lamas know the history of Buddhism, and especially the history of Buddhism in the West. And he said especially in America because, he said, that the emergence of Buddhism in the West may be, may have...it started, you know, it started with a very Descartes-like Buddhism. So it's a very dualistic Buddhism, so to speak. I can understand him, because even the most seasoned dharma practitioner in the West sometimes I do have doubt, how much they are really understanding. Of course we are not talking about actual realization of nonduality, but we are talking about intellectual understanding of nonduality. Because the concept is just not proveable. Because every logic, language, method of measurement, is dualistic. So dualistic method cannot measure and value something nondualistic. Always! And anything that cannot be proved, or anything that does not have a "manufacturing date," so to speak, I think in the materialistic world, modern world, it's all not really...it's a [struggle?], it's like a [struggle?], it really doesn't have much value in it.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NqRyAnyFNsA&list=TLh_vF6bhVwVLQjV8bMUeJ-ExvzM9778se (start from 4 minutes in)

Malcolm wrote:

This quote presents a false argument, one that is is very superficial.

DKR goes from the premise that because Buddhologists in general do not accept the idea that Mahāyāna was historically taught by the Buddha (in other words, texts were

composed that used the persona of the Buddha as a mouthpiece for various Mahāyāna doctrines) that they, indeed all Westerners, therefore are under suspicion of being incapable of understanding the nondual message taught in those texts.

His argument is at base a species of cultural chauvinism. This cultural chauvinism that DKR frequently expresses in his lectures is distressingly blind.

In sum, he starts with an issue of historiography and ends up leveling a charge of philosophical incompetence. DKR has a bad attitude about westerners. Its a pity really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 18th, 2013 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The Sarvastivada Abhidharma knew that when it is daytime in Jambudvīpa it is night on the Kuru continent. They possessed knowledge that is still valid about the universe and the planet Earth.

Mount Kailash is not mentioned in the Abhidharmakosha, it is a later interpretation, and it is wrong for several reasons, for example: the Sun and the Moon do not revolve around Mount Kailash, but they do revolve around the South pole (or North pole), when you adopt a flat earth presentation of our planet.

Malcolm wrote:

However the Surya Siddhanta's presentation of the universe (which has Meru at the north pole) wildly conflicts with Sarvastivadin cosmology.

Honestly, it is amazing to find people in the 21st century who try to prove that Abhidharmakosha's cosmology corresponds with the known facts of the universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

its simply a matter of intent: does one try to avoid participating in violence and killing as much as possible, or does one justify extra and unnecessary killing for the sake of one's gustatory pleasure?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "extra" suffering in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

heart said:

Well, I am talking about rig pa'i rtsal bang in the mengakde. I think the purpose is quite singular or else you would be introducing something that was still mind.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are different kinds of rig pa'i rtsal dbangs even within man ngag sde.

heart said:

Of course they are different. There are for Trechö and Tögal and every tradition have there own style. But are they introducing the natural state or not?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Its just not that simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thats a non-sequitur as a response to the question of intent and karma.

Malcolm wrote:

I answered your question. The answer is no (I am not claiming that intent is irrelevant when it comes to karma -- no one would unless they knew nothing about Buddhadharma).

gad rgyangs said:

then you admit that there is a karmic difference between "intent to kill & eat" vs. "intent to try and minimize killing while eating"?

Malcolm wrote:

You left out the middle one:

"Eating without intent to kill."

Anyway, killing is not the problem, the taking of life is. The latter requires intent. The former does not.

But eating anything that lives is a problem for something somewhere. All food involves the death of something else living.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

heart said:

Well, I am talking about rig pa'i rtsal bang in the mengakde. I think the purpose is quite singular or else you would be introducing something that was still mind.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are different kinds of rig pa'i rtsal dbangs even within man ngag sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The descent of the wisdom vajra empowerment procedure is detailed in in chapter 17 of the Jñānasiddhi of Indrabhuti.

It is not the same as a rig pa'i rtsal dbang.

M

heart said:

Which rigpai tsal wang are you talking about, there are many? But getting introduced directly to the nature of enlightenment is exactly what the rigpai tsal wang is about.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It's just not that simple, Magnus. There are two systems of rig pa'i rtsal bang -- sems sde

and man ngag sde. Even within man ngag sde there are different kinds of rig pa'i rtsal dbangs, not to mention different rig pa'i rtsal dbangs in anuyoga and mahayoga systems like the King's cycle of Avalokiteshvara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well, thanks for the helpful info about Rigpa'i Tsel Wang. Can we confirm Trekcho and Essence Mahamudra are not the same as a result?

Malcolm, I believe you're familiar with Drikung Kagyu transmissions--is this transmission Paul speaks of the "Vajra Pristine Awareness Empowerment" as discussed by Indrabhuti?

Malcolm wrote:

Vajra pristine awareness = ye shes rdo rje = jñānavajra.

It is very likely the same. The Eighth Situ also discusses this in his commentary on the Mahamudra Aspiration by the Third Karmapa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Pero said:

Yes well, I don't know when was the last time you went to a restaurant, cafeteria or a grocery etc. but these days (and as long as I've been alive) you don't come there and say "hey, I'd like some beef, go and kill some for me and I'll pay you". You come, there's meat, you buy or you don't.

It's just a silly argument.

gad rgyangs said:

the only thing this demonstrates is that you have no idea how an economy works or what "supply and demand" means.

Malcolm wrote:

And vegetarians, and especially vegans, have their head in the sand with respect to the necessity of animals being involved in the cycle of any viable sustainable, organic, local agricultural system.

for example, all that rice you eat is fertilized with feather meal and poultry litter which

comes from exactly the same abattoirs you are condemning. We are all eating animal inputs all the time whenever we eat any organically produced vegetables.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so you're claiming that intent is irrelevant when it comes to karma?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am observing that all living beings feed on other living beings. I will add that the distinction between sentient and non-sentient life is artificial and anachronistic.

M

gad rgyangs said:

thats a non-sequitur as a response to the question of intent and karma.

Malcolm wrote:

I answered your question. The answer is no (I am not claiming that intent is irrelevant when it comes to karma -- no one would unless they knew nothing about Buddhadharma).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

What if everyone were Buddhist? Who would man the slaughter-houses?

Malcolm wrote:

We have already performed this experiment in Tibet, Thailand, etc. The answer is that Buddhists would man the abattoirs and come up with rites of karmic expiation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

maybe it will at least keep the cannibals distracted for long enough that they eat a few less brother sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:
Life feeds on life, intentionally or not.

M

gad rgyangs said:
so you're claiming that intent is irrelevant when it comes to karma?

Malcolm wrote:
No, I am observing that all living beings feed on other living beings. I will add that the distinction between sentient and non-sentient life is artificial and anachronistic.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, October 17th, 2013 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra
Content:
heart said:

You read empowerment and you think that means something grand, it is just THE pointing-out instruction. Since it is definitive it certainly appropriately could be called "the decent of the vajra wisdom". It by-pass all shamatha/vipassana and tsa-lung and is a non-gradual path.

But really, I hope you go and see Rinpoche and discuss this with him. As you know I myself practice Dzogchen even if my Guru teach both.

/magnus

conebeckham said:
You are equating the Vajra Pristine Awareness empowerment with "Ngotro," Pointing Out Instructions, etc.
The question is, is "Ngotro," Pointing Out Instruction, the Fourth Empowerment of Anuttarayogatantra, or even the Rigpa'i Tsel Wang the same as this empowerment spoken of by Kongtrul? I cannot answer that question. If you get an answer to that question from any qualified guru, I'd be interested to hear it.

Malcolm wrote:
The descent of the wisdom vajra empowerment procedure is detailed in in chapter 17 of the Jñānasiddhi of Indrabhuti.

It is not the same as a rig pa'i rtsal dbang.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

maybe it will at least keep the cannibals distracted for long enough that they eat a few less brother sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Life feeds on life, intentionally or not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: khyung chen mkha' lding of Sri Simha

Content:

mutsum said:

JLA just told me some have been identified outside the Bima Nyingthik, like the khregs-chod bdun-pa (which was identified by Norbu Rinpoche).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am aware of the khregs chod bdun pa.

Thanks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 16th, 2013 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: khyung chen mkha' lding of Sri Simha

Content:

mutsum said:

It is Upadesha no. 44 from the collection of 119 Upadeshas (partially included in the Bima Nyingthik).

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have a location for the rest?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Sutra Mahamudra, Tantric Mahamudra, & Mahamudra

Content:

Jikan said:

I have to confess: as a somewhat badly informed outsider, I find the distinction between Sutra Mahamudra & Tantric Mahamudra somewhat baffling. Would someone please clarify for me what these categories mean in practical terms? eg, generally speaking, are these different approaches to practice, are they integrated into one trajectory of practice, or...? by that I mean, are there practitioners solely of Sutra Mahamudra, or Tantric Mahamudra, or are these paths different aspects of the same phenomenon?

Many thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Read Kongtrul's encyclopedia on practice lineages, he describes it perfectly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Why study Sanskrit?

Content:

yegyal said:

Actually, I've never met a Tibetan scholar-practitioner that didn't think studying Sanskrit was worthwhile.

Indrajala said:

I've seldom met anyone from the Himalayas who thought the study of Sanskrit was important and pursued it even at an elementary level. I've met a few, sure, but they're exceptions.

Malcolm wrote:

As Khedrup mentions, Lama Migmar reads Sanskrit with fluency; so does Lama Pema, another Sakya graduate of Varanasi. Students at Sakya College, on the other hand, do not study so much Sanskrit.

Those Tibetans seriously interested in Indian Buddhist texts make the effort. But your average Geshe, Lama, Khenpo, probably not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Why study Sanskrit?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

With the thousands of volumes of Buddhist texts available in Classical Tibetan and

Chinese, for example, the monks have plenty to "do nothing but study with". While Sanskrit is wonderful to study, modern Chinese and Tibetan monks still can build a firm foundational of scriptural knowledge without it.

Malcolm wrote:

Without question, knowledge of Sanskrit is very important. It is one factor that has given the Sakyapas the edge in scholarship for centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Why study Sanskrit?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Earlier a Tibetan monk said to me, "Why bother studying Sanskrit? Everything is available in Tibetan."

I have my own reasons, both personal and scholarly, for studying Sanskrit, though his question is pertinent.

Malcolm wrote:

His question is ridiculous -- much of what was translated into Tibetan cannot be properly understood without some Sanskrit grammar.

If you are never going to read a sutra or sastra from the bka' 'gyur or btan 'gyur, his point might have merit, otherwise? Not so smart.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: simple shrines

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it could be worse, you could be into this:

Notice, Elvis' halo is just a little brighter than that of Jesus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Sumeru?

Content:

Zhen Li said:

This only lends further credence to the fact that our world taken as a whole is Jambudvipa.

.

Malcolm wrote:

The main thing which upsets this theory is that Ptolemy knew and mentions the Uttarakurus in his geography.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uttarakuru>

It is pretty clear Jambudvipa refers to India, before the Sarvastivadins got out of hand. They were competing with Jains and Hindus in the cosmology game.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: khyung chen mkha' lding of Sri Simha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, I do not think so. The Tibetan is quite difficult and obscure in places.

Jikan said:

Thanks, Malcolm. You wouldn't know the text is so from the recent webcast on it, which has been absolutely lucid & accessible.

Malcolm wrote:

Rinpoche did not, and almost never does, literally translate the text. But of course he is lucid and accessible.

The text itself, however is not really not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: khyung chen mkha' lding of Sri Simha

Content:

Jikan said:

Has this text been translated publicly in English?

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

No, I do not think so. The Tibetan is quite difficult and obscure in places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: "Today I was enlightened"

Content:

Simon E. said:

And of course when and if he reads this it will confirm to him to his own satisfaction that he has transcended the outer form of Buddharma.

Malcolm wrote:

My guess is that he is an avid follower of Bud Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 15th, 2013 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: "Today I was enlightened"

Content:

Adamantine said:

I just don't understand why he is compelled to use the term "enlightenment", which at this point when using English in a spiritual context is a term associated with Nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really.

Anyway, followers of Buddhadharma [The Dharma of the fully awakened one] should use the term "awakening" [bodhi, byang chub] and full awakening, which is what "Buddha" [sangs ryas] actually means. I.e. being fully [rgyas] awakened [sangs] from the slumber of ignorance.

The term enlightened is too broad to be meaningful in the context of Buddhadharma. Further, there is actually no term in all of Buddhadharma which corresponds to the English words "enlightened" or "spiritually illuminated".

But there is a term which corresponds to "waking up", "awakening" i.e. Buddha, bodhisattva, bodhi, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Kunrig - uprooting samsara

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

can you use the sadhana in and of itself, is an "independent" practice to purify evil destinies, and do you need the lung and trid for it, or are these necessary?

Malcolm wrote:

You need the empowerment, the lung and the instruction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 14th, 2013 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Kunrig - uprooting samsara

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

Hi, i came across on vajrapublications this sadhana called

Kunrig - uprooting samsara.

does anyone know what its about and that if you need lung for it and is it practiced in other than the drikung lineage and what are the origins of this sadhana.

thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a sadhana for Sarvavidya related to the yoga tantra sarvadurgatiparishodana i.e. total purification of all evil destinies.

Sarvavidya is what some Kagyus, and the Sakyas and Gelugpas use for guiding people through the bardo. In Nyingma, one normally uses a practice connected with the peaceful and wrathful deities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 6:57 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

ClearblueSky said:

For example, smoking marijuana, though it doesn't have the negative chemicals of cigarettes, can still cause negative health consequences long term because you are inhaling burnt matter into your lungs.

Malcolm wrote:

For example? Which clinical studies are you citing? Oh, there aren't any since herb is illegal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

Malcolm. I would have never involved myself with that cult if Sakya Trizen, or anyone I contacted, had responded to my inquiries.

Sakya Trizen knew, Lama Migmar knew, but they didn't want to get their hands dirty.

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously you never asked me. I have always been forthright in my opinion about that situation in Miami.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

Because now I can ask you, as a human, what makes you more qualified than your teachers and what makes you a worthy receptacle of terms as opposed to the other people in this forum.

Malcolm wrote:

You clearly have a lot of anger. It is misplaced and poorly expressed.

Honestly who gives two shits about what Ivo Kalushev is doing in Mexico? Hopefully, he is eating some nice tortillas, beans and rice, drinking mescal occasionally, and enjoying the diving.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

KD, there is a fair amount of online information on the cult I mentioned now. Though Sakya Trizen still has not done ANYTHING to discredit it.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because Sakya Trizen never endorsed it, nor had anything to do with starting LR's fantasy to begin with.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:
dzogchungpa said:
What group are you talking about?

Malcolm wrote:
He is talking about a guy in florida named Luis Riesgo.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 3:52 AM
Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria
Content:
disjointed said:
Meanwhile, Sakya Trizen, like yourself Malcolm, did nothing to warn people about this cult using his name to validate itself, nor did he respond to people trying to verify the cult leader's claims.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, that is frankly false, as far as I am concerned. I warned many people.

But it is true I never waged a campaign against this person. That is not my job.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 3:46 AM
Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Basically, let me lay it out for you: Was anyone raped? Was any money embezzled? Was anyone deprived of their civil rights?
If the answer to those questions is no, then it is none of our business what these people or any one else is doing.

michaelb said:
Allegations of people being raped, having money embezzled and being deprived of their civil rights have been levelled against the most well known controversial 'Buddhist' groups in the west; NKT and Rigpa, for example.

I understand the caution not to turn into a Dharma cop and but if I was about to get involved with one of these groups I'd like to know about it and I'd hope Dharma practitioners on forums like this would have enough compassion to let me know before I stumbled into such a group.

Malcolm wrote:
1: formal religious veneration : worship
2: a system of religious beliefs and ritual; also : its body of adherents
3: a religion regarded as unorthodox or spurious; also : its body of adherents

4: a system for the cure of disease based on dogma set forth by its promulgator <health cults>

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cult>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

Malcolm.

Have you ever been the victim of a cult?

Malcolm wrote:

Have I ever been a victim of religion? No. I don't fit the profile. My egotism is much too strong.

Anyway, there are much worse things out there than tepid religious groups to get all concerned about.

Basically, let me lay it out for you: Was anyone raped? Was any money embezzled? Was anyone deprived of their civil rights?

If the answer to those questions is no, then it is none of our business what these people or any one else is doing.

Too many damn people feel like playing cop on the internet. It is a total waste of time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 13th, 2013 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

disjointed said:

Simon and Karma Dorje I have lived long enough to see cults form from innocent Buddhist groups I was involved with more than once, and many more times I have seen them turn from a distance and listened to the accounts of what transpired from students after they fall out of favor with the cult personality.

Malcolm wrote:

Wow, judge, jury and executioner.

Listen, we are talking about _religion_. All religions are cults by definition.

Just live and let live. If Ivo is the next Jim Jones, well, it is too early to tell, isn't it?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 12th, 2013 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: "Today I was enlightened"

Content:

disjointed said:

Simon. I presume you assume this Dzogchen teacher was well taught and fluent in the teachings of Dzogchen. He was not.

Malcolm wrote:

This person then was not a Dzogchen teacher, so your definition is flawed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 12th, 2013 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Trees are sentient beings?

Content:

TheSpirit said:

I am not exactly sure what Buddhists consider sentient beings. However I am just curious if it is possible for trees to be considered sentient beings in Buddhism? Is it possible for them to have a spiritual essence like we do?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, most writing in Buddhist dharma includes plants as part of the container universe.

Plants are recognized to be alive, but not sentient. The general thinking runs that plants have no [observable] sense organs, so they cannot be sentient.

There are some trends in East Asian Buddhism, however, as well as in Tibetan Buddhism (Dzogchen) that run counter to this commonly accepted notion of the nonsentience of plants.

Personally, I think plants exhibit sentient properties of various kinds. And because they use *prāṇa*, exhibit digestion, preferences, communicate. Whatever sentience they have however is likely to be very different than the sentience we ascribe to creatures in the invertebrate/vertebrate phyla.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Why should we privilege 21st century narratives over any other? Demons and menstrual blood speak to me in ways that ethnobotany never will.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a very sexist myth which perpetuates the theme of the uncleanliness of the menstrual discharge of women. Having studied many myths of plants, I cannot remember a single one where male demonic seed is cast as responsible for the growth of a plant considered pernicious.

Also, tobacco is the religious plant par excellence of Native Americans, occupying a place similar to juniper in Tibetan culture for rites of cleansing [bsangs] and the removal of pollution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

lol

nobody is answering my question here.

does anyone know if the ayurvedic herbal smokes close to crown chakra?, rendering phowa ineffective..

Malcolm wrote:

Should not be an issue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, the idea that tobacco springs from the menstrual blood of an evil demoness is a little silly since tobacco never existed in the old world until it was brought back from the new world by Europeans.

That being said, tobacco is pernicious if only for the fact that it takes up polonium 210 from the soil, rendering its smoke toxically radioactive, which is why for example, tobacco causes cancer but weed does not.

Jikan said:

Is it possible to read the text with the understanding that tobacco sprang from the menstrual blood of an evil demoness... without reference to geography or ethnobotany? That is, did the terton really need to specify that tobacco is a North American noxious weed for his text to have value?

Malcolm wrote:

In 19th century Tibet, no. In 21st century America, yes. Moreover, tobacco, like any plant, has medicinal as well as other uses. To characterize it as a weed is wrong. A plant is only a weed when it is not wanted or not understood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, the idea that tobacco springs from the menstrual blood of an evil demoness is a little silly since tobacco never existed in the old world until it was brought back from the new world by Europeans.

That being said, tobacco is pernicious if only for the fact that it takes up polonium 210 from the soil, rendering its smoke toxically radioactive, which is why for example, tobacco causes cancer but weed does not.

Karma Dorje said:

Are you saying that evil demonesses do not live in the New World, or simply that they don't menstruate?

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that the author of that terma clearly had no idea where tobacco came from originally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: does all smoking close the crown chakra

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

have you read about the termas that state that you will go to hell or lower realms because of smoking, are you afraid of this or do you think its something conquerable and not so solid fact?

Karma Dorje said:

I felt it definitely was negative for my health, and of course I was aware of Dudjom Rinpoche's statement on the effects of tobacco.

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, the idea that tobacco springs from the menstrual blood of an evil demoness is a little silly since tobacco never existed in the old world until it was brought back from the new world by Europeans.

That being said, tobacco is pernicious if only for the fact that it takes up polonium 210 from the soil, rendering its smoke toxically radioactive, which is why for example, tobacco causes cancer but weed does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 10th, 2013 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Matylda said:

Yeah Zhang Zhung... it was the closest. By still it was not Tibet in the sense of history, though they could pick up so much from previous kingdoms. It is just natural, that close nation, ethnically and in terms of language have some mutual exchange and influence... But I meant Tibet proper, not by whom it was influenced.

Malcolm wrote:

Zhang Zhung people were Tibetan. Zhang Zhung language is a dialect of Tibetan, and it is still spoken today.

Sherlock said:

AFAIK, this isn't what either ChNN or modern scholars say. Both agree that Zhang Zhung was related to Tibet but not quite the same.

Malcolm wrote:

The Zhang Zhung people were one of six tribes of Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Matylda said:

Yeah Zhang Zhung... it was the closest. By still it was not Tibet in the sense of history, though they could pick up so much from previous kingdoms. It is just natural, that close nation, ethnically and in terms of language have some mutual exchange and influence... But I meant Tibet proper, not by whom it was influenced.

Malcolm wrote:

Zhang Zhung people were Tibetan. Zhang Zhung language is a dialect of Tibetan, and it is still spoken today.

Matylda said:

But GY? was it really spread widely and accepted in India? Even in AYT texts? You mentioned only Hevajra, what about other AYT lineages in India?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Yes. I mentioned two traditions, Hevajra and Vajrayogini. For example, there are three gurusadhanas translated by a Vibhutipandita into Tibetan. Another text entitled gurumandalasamadana vidhi translated by one of three Dro Lotsawas ('bro lo ts'a ba) which describes a method of practicing the guru, he is invited in front, one makes offerings to him, praises, etc., exactly the way that guru yogas are done in the Tibetan tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just who says Tibetans were poorly educated? They had writing, etc. prior to the 7th century.

Why? There were Chinese Monasteries in Lhasa. There were Indian monks, central Asian monks. Tibetans traded widely in India as well as China. And they were the bosses of Central Asia until the 840's and the Chinese economic crisis.

Matylda said:

Well, but how far the society was literate? Was it restricted to the court or some privileged groups what could be rather limited representation? And as for the seal, is one seal enough to prove wide spread written language, or was it just fancy property of the court? I have no idea if there is enough evidence of written language used by majority of Tibetans. In case of China written language was predominant in all parts of China already for ages. Yes military Tibet was very strong and occupied western parts of China, and Chinese missionaries were in Lhasa, however not only there, but in many countries outside of China. Including many monks who traveled to India since II century...

Tibet was in the VII and VIII century just entering the Buddhist way. In China it was predominant religion at that time with history of seven hundred years.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans had long term contact with India and Buddhists. They were surrounded by Buddhist countries for a thousand years. Buddhist yogis, as well as Hindu Yogis frequented the region around Kailash.

Zhang Zhung was a kingdom bordering India. Every evidence points to the fact that while Tibetans themselves may not have developed writing, their ethnic cousins, Zhangzhung

people, had done so, and that Tibetans, in a sort of cultural fealty to Zhang Zhung, adopted their writing, customs, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

smcj said:

Just who says Tibetans were poorly educated? They had writing, etc. prior to the 7th century.

They did? I thought written language was imported from India around then. You sure? Any existing texts (presumably Bonpo) from that period?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is what western scholars would like people to believe. But this is based on an improper reading of what early Tibetan texts actually say about the issue. It is true that Thonmi Sambhota adapted Gupta script to the Tibetan language. But there is sufficient evidence that the court of Zhang Zhang was using writing during the reign of Srong btsan sgam po. We have for example Ligmincha's seal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Matylda said:

So when vajryana arrived in China, it had completely different background for development, also there were many more literati people to accommodate, study or practice compare to rather poorly educated Tibetan society at that time.

Malcolm wrote:

Just who says Tibetans were poorly educated? They had writing, etc. prior to the 7th century.

[/quote]

Anyway to compare state of Buddhism in China and Tibet in the mid of the VIII century is rather risky. Background of both was totally different.[/quote]

Why? There were Chinese Monasteries in Lhasa. There were Indian monks, central Asian monks. Tibetans traded widely in India as well as China. And they were the bosses of Central Asia until the 840's and the Chinese economic crisis.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But this is not true, and I already presented two texts which negate this idea -- which somehow you seem to ignore.

Indrajala said:

I think the key point here is the guru yoga that we now know.

Malcolm wrote:

What Guru yogas do you have in mind? As I pointed out, the basic bones of the practice was well-established in India.

The practice of turning historical teachers like Padmasambhava into objects of Guru Yoga I agree is a Tibetan innovation, but in terms of the skeleton of Guru Yoga, it is like I said. And further, in traditions like Sakya, they adhere principally to the Indian style of Guru yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 9th, 2013 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dunhuang records indicate no such thing.

Indrajala said:

They don't indicate a strongly Buddhist culture by any means. Let me cite an immediate example that comes to mind:

Malcolm wrote:

By your post, you must think I am referring to the 7th century Tibet. But I am not. I am referring to 8th century Tibet, namely to the reign of Khri strong lde' bstan. No one disputes that Buddhism was not a presence in Tibet prior to the reign of Srong btsan sgam po.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Indrajala said:

For one thing, the Dunhuang records indicate Tibet was hardly a Buddhist culture at the time, and the Chinese at the time didn't seem to know of that much Buddhism in Tibet throughout the Tang.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dunhuang records indicate no such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Indrajala said:

In any case, guru yoga as it is found in Tibet does not seem to have ever existed in East Asia, even in the last period of Vajrayāna transmission into China, which is noteworthy and supports Mayer's idea:

Clearly then, the guru yoga that we now know developed in Tibet, not in India.

Malcolm wrote:

But this is not true, and I already presented two texts which negate this idea -- which somehow you seem to ignore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna was introduced to China primarily by a single master.

Indrajala said:

You are mistaken. The three eminent early masters include Śubhakarasiṃha 善無畏 (637-735), Vajrabodhi (671-741) 金剛智 and Amoghavajra (705-774) 不空.

Malcolm wrote:

Note, I said primarily. These other two masters did not have the lasting influence Amoghavajra did.

Indrajala said:

The Chinese court, clergy and economy were in a better position than Tibet to provide the necessary institutions, crafts and so forth to facilitate the transmission of Vajrayāna.

It isn't all about dates.

Malcolm wrote:

Samye is a pretty sizable place. The Tibetans were the dominant power in Asia during the 8th century.

The main point however is that the kind of Vajrayāna practiced in Tibet in the late eight century was basically identical that practiced in China during the same time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, Jeff, you consistently say that Vajrayāna in China was "earlier" than that in Tibet. But this is not really true.

Indrajala said:

Tantric Buddhism was more systematically introduced into China before it was into Tibet it seems.

It seems the Chinese tradition preserved earlier developments more than the Tibetans did. This is the opinion of some Japanese scholars which classify Shingon/Zhenyan as 'middle period' esoteric Buddhism, while Tibetan is generally more associated with a 'later period'.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna was introduced to China primarily by a single master.

Vajrayāna was introduced some thirty years (or earlier) later into Tibet by a large number of masters. After all, Samye was completed by 779 at the latest on a Vajrayāna plan. This means that Padmasambhava was present in Tibet not later than 775. This is a mere 34 years after Amoghavajra returned from his travels in 746.

When we examine these claims purely on the basis of historical dates, the claim that Vajrayāna in China is significantly "earlier" than Tibetan Imperial period Vajrayāna seems to be vastly overstated. Further, the unrestricted translation of so called anuttarayoga texts in Tibet was actually forbidden by royal edict and the main practices of the imperial period at Samye were grounded in Tattvasamgraha and the Vajrasikhara, just as in China and in Japan (from 804 onwards). Practices such as Vajrakilaya, which do date to that period, were very secret and not public at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The practice of making use of historical or quasi historical figures for Guru yoga is a Tibetan innovation. It seems in India, gurus were generally imagined in the form of one's devatā.

Konchog1 said:

So the Indians didn't visualize the lineage Gurus? Just their Guru?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, in many practices, the master of one's family meditated at the crown is one's guru, even in lower tantras.

BTW, Jeff, you consistently say that Vajrayāna in China was "earlier" than that in Tibet. But this is not really true.

Vajrayāna was brought to Tibet during the reign of khri strong lde'u btsan which lasted from 755 to 797 or 804 depending on whose account you follow. Amoghavajra only translated a portion of the Tattvasamgraha into Chinese in 754, though he translated a number of other texts. Considering that it is very likely that the yoga tantra, etc., we see comes from South India by way of Java and so on, both by tradition and by textual evidence, and the so called annutaratyoga tantras such as Guhyasamaja are sited in Oḍḍiyāna from the start, this accounts for the very different characters of Tibetan and Chinese Vajrayāna traditions, not "earlier" and "later" since Guhyasamaja and so on were certainly in circulation by early 700's. Be that as it may, the main shrine in Samayas was devoted to the Vajradhātu Maṇḍala pointing to the presence of Tattvasamgraha by 790 at the latest in Tibet.

sarvadurgatipariśodhanatejorājāyatathāgatasyārhatasamyaksambuddhasyakalpanāma, guhyasamaja, and so on are present in the ldan dkar catalogue pointing to its early presence in Tibet. Anyway, the Tattvasamgraha was never completely translated in Chinese until the 11th century, or perhaps the late tenth, around the same time it was translated into Tibetan.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jeff, you have to keep in mind that a lot of ritual procedures written by Tibetans were held in the memories of Indian practitioners since they are a deep cultural part of India.

Indrajala said:

Sure, but then we need to ask why tantric traditions in China never seemed to have had comparable practices (but correct me if I'm wrong).

Malcolm wrote:

I explained that -- Guru yoga, as well as mandala offerings, are quite specific to the annutarayoga tantra phase in India. These tantras were not imported to China in any systematic way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Indian Vajrayana

Content:

Khechara said:

Hello there. Well, I don't know him personally but from what I do know about him, he is far from being an 'ordinary syncretic Hindu'. The Vajrayana tradition which he belongs to is an old Nath lineage. I came across one of his short books, "In Search of Tantra: Vajrayana" on Scribd. This was published for an academic session on the subject a few years ago. I'd like to know what you discussed with him.

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/51812667/tantra-book-format-small>

Malcolm wrote:

This is basically a synthesis of Shaiva-agama with Mahāyāna Buddhism with a sprinkling of Vajrayāna thrown for good measure. A lot of talk of "god" and "self" there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 8th, 2013 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

smcj said:

Who's Lawapa?

Malcolm wrote:

Luipa, the first siddha to write down a Cakrasamvara sadhana. Also there is the Vajrayogini sadhana penned by Naropa which has a very clearly indicated guru yoga section.

Jeff, you have to keep in mind that a lot of ritual procedures written by Tibetans were held in the memories of Indians practitioners since they are a deep cultural part of India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 7th, 2013 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Guru yoga not Indian?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I always thought it unusual how nothing comparable to Tibetan guru yoga seems to have existed in Chinese esoteric Buddhism (though correct me if I'm wrong), and attributed this perhaps to an earlier period of Indian tantra being transmitted into China. But if Mayer is correct, such guru yoga is a Tibetan innovation.

Malcolm wrote:

That entirely depends on what you mean by "innovation". Guru Yoga certainly exists in a few Indian sources. For example, a general outline of Guru Yoga as it is universally practiced today is provided in the Hevajrasya hastavyavagrāhakrama-nāma.

In general, Guru yoga is only an annutarayoga tantra practice.

The practice of making use of historical or quasi historical figures for Guru yoga is a Tibetan innovation. It seems in India, gurus were generally imagined in the form of one's devatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 7th, 2013 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Christian Influences in Modern Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

I think this movement towards socially engaged Buddhism around the world is actually a result of Buddhists not really believing in saṃsāra any longer.

Malcolm wrote:

I would hesitate to agree with this. Instead I think that "Engaged Buddhism" largely is an offshoot of three things, Gandhi's Satyagraha, the civil rights and antiwar movements in the late sixties and early seventies.

Indrajala said:

It used to be seen as worthwhile to provide institutions and so forth for people to work towards liberation from saṃsāra, but nowadays such goals are not really seen as worthwhile in many circles. Buddhism has to justify its existence by providing liberation from worldly stress and pastoral care..

Malcolm wrote:

You mention Tibet -- but you seem to fail to recognize that the success or failure of Tibetan monasteries was entirely dependent on the perceived efficacy of lamas in a monastery and providing medical services and pastoral, a.k.a, religious services to the laity. Those in retreat were always a minority. Lay people in Tibet for the most part never concerned much with liberation, doing the usual merit dance of lay Buddhists

everywhere. In fact, there is an entire literature devoted to excoriating Tibetans lay and ordained alike for their "non-belief" samsara aka engagement in eight worldly dharmas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: blocking realization

Content:

duffster1 said:

I heard Chogyal Namkhai Noru Rinpoche say at the webcast today that everyone has the potential to realize rainbow body and then he said that one can block that potential and then one has no possibility of realizing it in this life? Is it possible to block one's possibility of having realization for their entire life?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. It is called "having huge misconceptions about the teachings".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

Trungpa

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, you are flogging a dead horse. You aren't one of those one issue posters, are you? I hope to see more from you than "sexual misconduct", "Trungpa", "ethics", etc.

Otherwise, I am afraid I will find you quite boring.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

The same could be said of Mme Blavatsky.

Malcolm wrote:

The influence of the Theosophical Society on the early history of Buddhism in the West is indisputable, despite her many misconceptions about Tibetan Buddhism in particular.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

I readily admit that he is famous and influential. But in what way can he be said to have done "so much good"?

Malcolm wrote:

Hmmm, well, CTR's books have introduced literally millions of people to Buddhadharma for one...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

Malcolm wrote: Alfredo seems to think that Ivo needs to be called out at as a fraud. No--not yet, anyway. I haven't seen anything to suggest that he's insincere, though it is possible that he is deluded, and many aspects of his teachings (and the group dynamics underlying them) do raise ethical concerns. Again, I would honestly appreciate additional information. For example, the anecdotes of the several people who have interacted with him in the past, and posted above, I find revealing.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have better ways to spend your time?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, most of us who have been around for any length of time have come to the conclusion that trying to out unethical teachers doesn't work. Their students just cling tighter, and circle the wagons. For example, Mary Finnegan has been waging a war on Sogyal Rinpoche for more than twenty years. Is he any less successful? No. He is more successful than ever.

dzogchungpa said:

Is Sogyal an unethical teacher in your opinion?

Malcolm wrote:

If the reports are true...but I do not know that they are...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, October 6th, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Simon E. said:

As I said above others have the knowledge to read the nuances between the lines here than the degree of my knowledge allows..but we seem to have segued from general misgivings to association with well documented sexual predation ..is there evidence for that kind of abuse from 'Ivo ' ?

Have I missed something ?

Malcolm wrote:

Alfredo seems to think that Ivo needs to be called out at as a fraud. My own position is that whether Ivo is a fraud, deluded, or authentic does not matter to me in the slightest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Christian Influences in Modern Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Those deities were there from the start. But you can see Buddhist exclusivity rising in Indian Mahāyāna texts that define refuge, and so on.

Indrajala said:

Nevertheless, there is plenty of heterogenetic development to be discerned.

Malcolm wrote:

I see it as appropriation.

There are three modes of conversion in Buddhism:

Setting a good example (early Buddhism)

Charity (Middle Buddhism)

Subjugation through appropriation (Late Buddhism, esp. Vajrayāna).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Christian Influences in Modern Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

It wasn't that exclusive when you consider how many Vedic deities were embraced. Just look at the art record alone with all the Hindu epics being splashed around temples.

Malcolm wrote:

Those deities were there from the start. But you can see Buddhist exclusivity rising in Indian Mahāyāna texts that define refuge, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Christian Influences in Modern Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

There's a few more aspects I'd like to discuss:

- The view that the Pali canon best represents an original Buddhism via a historical Buddha, and that this is worth adhering to as a pure or authentic Buddhism (getting to the "true teachings" of the Buddha, not unlike getting to the original teachings of Christ).

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly an issue for Theravadins.

-

Indrajala said:

The new exclusive nature of Buddhism, whereby self-identifying Buddhists are actively discouraged from participating in non-Buddhist religious activities.

Malcolm wrote:

False, Tibetan Buddhism has been very exclusionary from the beginning. It has to do with how refuge is defined in late Indian texts.

Indrajala said:

- In some modern Buddhist traditions a distaste for rituals, 'superfluous iconography' and archaic liturgy (Protestant influences).

Malcolm wrote:

Some truth in this.

-

Indrajala said:

In some traditions, centralized administrations with a key figurehead and his or her

elites in charge of all major decisions and policies with underlings expected to show obedience (Catholic influences).

Malcolm wrote:

Represents a total misunderstanding of the nature of Tibetan Buddhism, both here and in Tibet.

Indrajala said:

I think the most pertinent influence from Christianity has quite possibly been the second on the list: the new Buddhist self-identity where exclusivity is now seen as important and worth emphasizing. Of course in the past "Buddhists" existed, but as we know even today were often readily able and willing to participate in all manner of other practices and ideologies, and even incorporate them. Christian-like exclusivity for Buddhists is probably a fairly new development in most cultures.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so. I imagine you can find the roots of Buddhist exclusivity in the post-Gupta environment, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

The notion that it is enough to focus on our own teachers, and ignore the wider ethical problems plaguing Tibetan Buddhism (or Buddhism in general), to me shows a lack of spiritual responsibility.

Malcolm wrote:

So what do you suggest? Frankly, most of us who have been around for any length of time have come to the conclusion that trying to out unethical teachers doesn't work. Their students just cling tighter, and circle the wagons. For example, Mary Finnegan has been waging a war on Sogyal Rinpoche for more than twenty years. Is he any less successful? No. He is more successful than ever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria

Content:

Alfredo said:

But some of his practices can be practiced now, without going to Mexico. Besides, where exactly do you think "here" is?

Lama Ivo has already told his side of the story in some detail on his website, so before asking him to comment, it might be better to read that first. I was actually hoping to

learn what other people say about him, in the hopes that that would prove revealing.

So far my impression (from reading his website) has been mixed. On one hand, he seems serious, intense, and knowledgeable. I can hardly fault him for being a Westerner, or an iconoclast. On the other, he has obviously groomed his followers to obey him with some intensity, even when he guides them in unexpected directions. This model of guru-dom is one which I wish could be reformed out of Vajrayana, not simply universalized to make it less Tibetan. But then, I am an unenlightened wretch, so what do I know?

Malcolm wrote:
I read it.

Who cares? Unless you are interested in being his student, of what concern is it to you?

After all this nonsense about Ngagpa Chogyam, Roach, etc., if I have learned anything at all, people are going to believe whatever the hell they want no matter what anyone else says.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, October 5th, 2013 at 6:43 AM
Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Honestly, who cares? No one here is going to run off to Mexico to become a student of Ivo's or practice these things. Best to let it alone.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, October 3rd, 2013 at 10:19 PM
Title: Re: Lama Ivo Kalushev of Bulgaria
Content:
Alfredo said:
Is anybody familiar with Lama Ivo? He is a Bulgarian with a Nyingma background, who in some sense broke away from this tradition a few years ago when he received/created a cycle of treasure-texts. His center is located in Mexico:

michaelb said:
Ivo used to be on e-sangha under a few user names.

Malcolm wrote:
Who?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 1st, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

anjali said:

Yes, the knowing quality of the mind is fundamentally empty. As far as I know, no one is saying otherwise. However, this doesn't preclude the possibility self-reflexive knowing. This is why, in a reply to daverupa, I noted that we need to be clear on the distinction between self-reflexive knowing and self-grasping. Self-knowing is just that, knowing that knows itself. Nothing more. Relative to the trikaya model, it is only the ignorance of self-grasping that imputes a substantial (instead of empty), isolated (instead of unified with it's radiance) self-knowing.

Astus said:

We know that we are sentient beings simply because we sense things and we are aware of this process. This is self-awareness. Would you call this knowing that knows itself? If so, this is not a problematic idea at all. Only if you suppose some independent knowing that knows itself is there a problem.

Malcolm wrote:

what do you mean by independent knowing?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la

Content:

WuMing said:

There is no afterlife, just one long bardo that begins with delusion and ends with awakening.

taken from

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=36&t=14140&view=unread&sid=85d265cd34a332ed0dc45b71dd878f6b#unread>

gad rgyangs said:

I like that one too. I've never seen it put quite that way before.

Malcolm wrote:

Can't take credit for it, it comes from Nyi ma 'bum, 11th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Jetsun Taranatha

Content:

smcj said:

Well, that's certainly not mentioned in the Kagyu histories!

Malcolm wrote:

Not only that, but they exist in Sakya Lam 'bras as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Jetsun Taranatha

Content:

smcj said:

Taking this thread even farther afield: Marpa's son is an adept so he transfers consciousness to another body.

This practice, which we still have the sadhana for, evidently caused a lot of problems. So it was decided to allow the practice to die out. No empowerment was given to the next generation, so the practice became inert, dead. You can get the text, and do the sadhana, but since there is no lineage empowerment available, you'd just be wasting your time. Nobody today can make it work anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

grong 'jug practices still exist in Nyingma with uninterrupted transmissions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Presumably you mean a buddha's self-knowing is not self-reflexive, in that mind cannot take itself as its own object. Mind would have to take a 'step back' in order to see itself, thereby setting up an infinite regression. It must somehow know itself without taking itself as an object, correct?

Malcolm wrote:

The buddhas self-knowing is precisely self-reflexive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 12:35 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: Monday, September 30th, 2013 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Longde Teachings

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Ok then..thanks Malcolm..so its the entire initiation that is required not just the lung. Got it. Interesting how these things work. Sometimes all you need is just to hear Rinpoche say a mantra etc and other times you need an entire initiation. Wish there was a guideline book out there for all of these things or even have it posted on the website what exactly is required for each thing that Rinpoche teaches...sure would be helpful...

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, a lung does not have direct introduction. And typically, Rinpoche is a stickler for transmitting things he received in the manner in which he received them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Longde Teachings

Content:

Fa Dao said:

ok then, so if it isnt the AOM/Ngondzong Gyalpo lung then I wonder what does exactly constitute transmission for Longde?

Malcolm wrote:

The Ngondzong Gyalpo initiation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

This is precisely how it is described in prajnaparamita for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but no.

oushi said:

Your "arguments" are not convincing...

Perfection of wisdom in 8000 lines, chapter XII.

Malcolm wrote:

Abhisamaya alaṃkāra, the whole book, which explains the hidden meaning of the PP

sūtras, including the scope and content of the two kinds of omniscience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

By definition, conditioned and unconditioned are mutually exclusive.

Malcolm wrote:

By definition they are mutually unintelligible without the other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 8:34 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

This is precisely how it is described in prajnaparamita for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Omniscience is irreversible, that is why your statement is trivial and untrue.

oushi said:

All-knowing is always available since it is present through unknowability of all dharmas.

Because dharmas are imperceptible, omniscience is free from knowing.

Simply speaking, there is nothing that can be known.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, that is really not how omniscience is described, you are entitled to whatever you like to think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

That which is know, can also be unknown, thus it is not ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

Trivial and untrue.

oushi said:

I thought you can do better than that. It is very simple, thus difficult to refute. Probably that's why you went straight to trivializing it. Knowing cannot be ultimate simply because it can be unknown.

Malcolm wrote:

Omniscience is irreversible, that is why your statement is trivial and untrue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When you have relinquished all traces for rebirth, automatically the twelve āyatana will cease at the break up of the body. This is classic "hināyāna" nirvana. Peter Harvey's books suggests that after the eradication of affliction there is a tiny shred of evidence in the Nikayas that Buddha suggests that there is a which vinnana/vijñāna survives in a now unconditioned state (i.e. a state unconditioned by affliction) and that this is nirvana intended by the Buddha. He nevertheless insists that this continuum is not to be referred to as a self, and that Buddha would find it inappropriate to do so.

Koji said:

There is also that odd ayantana:

There is, monks, that ayantana wherein there is neither earth, nor water, nor fire, nor air ... and so on. (Udana VIII, i).

And speaking of Peter and the attā:

"As will be shown below, though, the early sources used by the Theravāda are bereft of any such explicit denial. The idea that Buddhism, 'denies the self', though, has become a commonplace of Religious Studies" (Peter Harvey, The Selfless Mind, p. 7).

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, but you have to read the last chapter, where he gives his conclusion. It all basically boils down to what Nāgārjuna says, sometimes Buddha said self, sometimes he said not self, and one needs to understand the context. When the self is used a prajñāpti, a designation, then this is acceptable. When trying to discern the nature of things, it is not acceptable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

That which is know, can also be unknown, thus it is not ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

Trivial and untrue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

So, when you say that knowing knows itself, emptiness and radiance, that is actually the Huayan model. Although logically to say that knowing includes (knows) knowing is nothing but stating that knowing is knowing.

anjali said:

The question on the table is whether the knowing quality of the mind can turn back on itself (self-reflexive knowing)? To hijack a zen phrase, is it possible to "turn the light and illuminate back?" From the perspective of self-reflexive knowing, this can be interpreted as taking the light of one's awareness and turning it back on itself. There are folks who say this can be done, and describe it as a singular experience.

Malcolm wrote:

The omniscience of the a buddha is self-knowing, as I mentioned before.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 29th, 2013 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

But religion can also be this: "All religion expresses itself in such an awareness of something outside and beyond nature." ~ Schleiermacher

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, smoke and mirrors. Pabulum to feed the confused and ignorant. As the Buddha pointed out, there is nothing outside of the twelve āyatana.

Koji said:

Correct, there is nothing outside of the twelve āyatanas like another twelve āyatanas, or like another sabba beyond the first sabba. At SN 35:23 we learn that the sabba is the 12 ayatana. At SN 35:24 the Buddha teaches us the Dhamma for abandoning sabba (sabbappahānāya). At SN 35:28 we learn the sabba is burning. Seeing thus the Ariyasāvaka experiences a revulsion towards the 12 ayatana after which he is liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

When you have relinquished all traces for rebirth, automatically the twelve āyatanas will cease at the break up of the body. This is classic "hināyāna" nirvana. Peter Harvey's books suggests that after the eradication of affliction there is a tiny shred of evidence in the Nikayas that Buddha suggests that there is a which vinnana/vijñāna survives in a now unconditioned state (i.e. a state unconditioned by affliction) and that this is nirvana intended by the Buddha. He nevertheless insists that this continuum is not to be referred to as a self, and that Buddha would find it inappropriate to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Bodhidharma's Courtesan

Content:

Indrajala said:

It seems the real successor to Bodhidharma was someone other than what the official records tell us.

Any thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

He's pretty short in the picture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

But religion can also be this: "All religion expresses itself in such an awareness of something outside and beyond nature." ~ Schleiermacher

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, smoke and mirrors. Pablum to feed the confused and ignorant. As the Buddha pointed out, there is nothing outside of the twelve āyatana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The question is, why would anyone believe your testimony.

Koji said:

You need a NPOV on the matter.

Malcolm wrote:

This is religion, baby, it is all just smoke and mirrors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: I have some proof here that there's no afterlife

Content:

gandy said:

so how does buddhism reconcile with this?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no afterlife, just one long bardo that begins with delusion and ends with awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

In the internalised trikaya model, as you said, the three are explained separately but they are not actually three different things. There are a number of ways to explain that. The simplest is the statement of the third "kaya" that emptiness and clarity are inseparable; here it is understood that clarity includes all appearances, it is dependent origination.

Malcolm wrote:

This is in line with Mahāmudra schools like Kagyu and Sakya's take on things. But rang bzhin gsal ba which is the sambhogakāya in Dzogchen teachings is definitely not all appearances and is not dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

conebeckham said:

This leads to the question: for those who feel they have "had an experience" or "experienced" Wisdom or Buddhamind or whatnot, and have somehow consequently conceptualized that experience as a sort of "Self," is that "experience" really the experience of Wisdom that is talked about in Sutra, Tantra, and Upadesha? Or is it a mistaken experience?

Koji said:

Let's say I had the experience of attaining nirvana whose self-nature (svabhâva) is that of being unconditioned and, moreover, my attainment is incapable of being conceptualized. How can I be refuted? In fact, there is no way I can be refuted.

Malcolm wrote:

The question is, why would anyone believe your testimony.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

When there is no "internal stimulus", it means there is no mental movement, no mental phenomena. And that means unconsciousness, mindlessness.

jeeprs said:

Why then is there significance given to dhyana states such as the 'immaterial dhyanas'? Do you think when yogis are in those states they are simply inert? Might they as well be asleep? The way I would understand it, this is what is implied by 'passing beyond duality', but it is not simply 'unconsciousness'. It is consciousness without the sense of there being an observer. "Contentless consciousness" is one description I have read.

Malcolm wrote:

Those yogis are governed by the concept that propells them into that formless āyatana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

But you did not comment on this:

And since, in a non-dual state, the experiencer is the experienced, the experiencer must also be an illusion. So we could all be merely part of a computer simulation such as The Matrix and the Buddha is part of that as well. Or the Hindu belief that we are all the dream of the God Brahma is correct and Buddha is also part of the dream.

And that would be a problem.

The fact that you did not comment on the above is to me, a reflection of the difficulty of avoiding the extremes of unconditioned and conditioned, and by extension the extreme position of the other mutually exclusive pairs such as permanent and impermanent, existence and non-existence etc. by using those very words, ie. words such as conditioned and unconditioned etc.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what you mean by nondual. There are three kinds of non dualism. One is cognitive non dualism, i.e., everything is consciousness, for, like example Yogacara. The second is ontological nondualism, i.e. everything is brahman, god, etc. The third is epistemic nondualism, i.e., being, non-being and so on cannot be found on analysis and therefore do not ultimately exist.

The indivisibility of the conditioned and the unconditioned is based on the third. We have only experience of conditioned phenomena. Unconditioned phenomena like space are known purely through inference since they have no characteristics of their own to speak of. When we analyze phenomena, what do we discover? We discover suchness, an unconditioned state, the state free from extremes. That unconditioned state cannot be discovered apart from conditioned phenomena, therefore, we can say with confidence that the conditioned and the unconditioned are nondual. The trick is which version of nonduality you are invoking. This nonduality of the conditioned and unconditioned cannot apply to the first two nondualities for various reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: what is a melong?

Content:

Jikan said:

Thanks to all for the helpful responses. quick follow-up on Dzogchen Community specific applications of the melong:

Have there been design changes in the DC-made melongs? The new ones have the Longsal symbol on the back, while I think I remember seeing some with a different design on the back (with the six syllables around the edge if memory serves). Is there a difference in function for each of these, or does the change in design reflect different considerations? or am I completely mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are three versions. The oldest version that has a triangle with a bliss swirl in the center. The version which has been in service since early ninties that has the syllables of the six lokas as well as a the longsal symbol, and the smaller version that has only the longsal symbol.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The essence of the mind cannot be different than mind, otherwise it would not be the essence of the mind. It would be like suggesting that fire and the nature of fire [heat] were distinct.

dzogchungpa said:

This essence of the mind is the same as what they call the basis of the individual in Dzogchen?

bump

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

I am just wondering, but how does one personally know "there is just experience"? Of course we all know that anyone can imagine such as state but what the imagination concocts doesn't mean it is either real or attainable.

Astus said:

If there is something that is not an experience you don't experience it, consequently you don't know anything about it. What is not an experience is nothing more than a presumption, a hypothesis, a fantasy, an idea.

Koji said:

When you said ealier: There is neither an experiencer nor an experienced, there is just experience, and even that is empty, does this pertain to "a presumption, a hypothesis, a fantasy, an idea"?

Malcolm wrote:

The emptiness of things is even something you assent to, Ardent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

So this is not the views and tenet system you claimed to not have?

Malcolm wrote:

The essence of the mind is not something you need to analyze to discover. When you have discovered you do not need a theory to account for it, no more than you need a theory to account for the heat of a fire once you have been burned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

I guess you think there is a Self too since you also think that Buddhahood is not an aggregate.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhahood is merely the realization of the nature of phenomena, that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Longde Teachings

Content:

oldbob said:

For me, it is enough that people have a pointing out instruction on the nature of mind, and then remember that everything is included in the infinite potentiality of nature of mind.

Sönam said:

This is also what ChNN says ... integration.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but the question is what is required to practice the methods of Long sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

conebeckham said:

Agreed....though we can discuss the differences between Thamal Gyi She Pa, so-called "Ordinary Mind," and discursive thinking, etc....these are terms of art, I think. Ultimately, there is only one thing...but it ain't a Self.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Yangongpa, the term tha mal gyi shes pa is just a yogis term for wisdom (ye shes). He mentions this in his commentary on Sahaja Mahāmudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that Buddhahood was an aggregate, I cited a sūtra that states quite unequivocally that buddhahood is to be sought in one's mind, and not elsewhere.

conebeckham said:

Agreed. Mind is an aggregate, that should be obvious to anyone with a handful of Dharma study. And it should also be obvious to all that Buddhahood should be sought "in one's mind."

But Buddhahood is not "mind." It is related to Nature of Mind, which is different from Mind. Put another way, we must use "mind" to identify Nature of Mind.....that is the first step. But equating Nature of Mind with a "Great Self" is a slippery slope....expedient means, maybe, for some.

Malcolm wrote:

The essence of the mind cannot be different than mind, otherwise it would not be the essence of the mind. It would be like suggesting that fire and the nature of fire [heat] were distinct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Do you consider the Mind to be an Aggregate?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course it is an aggregate: manas, vijñāna and citta are all synonyms.

Son of Buddha said:

then as the sutras and suttas I quoted state Buddhahood is not an Aggregate
so do you take Buddhahood to be an Aggregate even though the suttas/sutras say it is not?

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that Buddhahood was an aggregate, I cited a sūtra that states quite unequivocally that buddhahood is to be sought in one's mind, and not elsewhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

you represent the tenet system called Dzogchen.....hence why it has a label for which to label itself and its followers.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a tenet system.

Son of Buddha said:

sure it is

do you receive a teaching in Dzogchen from a teacher?

what is his teachings to you???

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is one's state which can be discovered. It is not something about which one needs to speculate and analyze.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Do you consider the Mind to be an Aggregate?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course it is an aggregate: manas, vijñāna and citta are all synonyms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 28th, 2013 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

you represent the tenet system called Dzogchen.....hence why it has a label for which to label itself and its followers.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a tenet system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

(P.S. when did I say Buddhahood lies outside the mind?)

Malcolm wrote:

When you said that your truly existent self lies outside of the aggregates, and that that is buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: 13 Precious Drikung Kagyu Empowerments

Content:

heart said:

I really think you have to watch this live if you really want the empowerment. Recordings are no good.

/magnus

Karma Dorje said:

Magnus is right, the dharmakaya only pervades everything during the empowerment.

The rest of the time you are SOL.

Malcolm wrote:

If people have faith in this, then fine. I don't personally believe one can receive a valid empowerment though a recording. But that is just me following the advice of my guru. Your mileage might vary.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

I represent one view you represent another view.....hence a living example of your duality.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't represent a view or a tenet system. But when I examine what is stated in Buddhist texts, I do not see your view of them to be a very accurate picture.

For example, The Aryātajñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra claims: The mind is realized; since it is wisdom one should meditate on the idea of not seeking buddhahood elsewhere.

The tenet system of you, Ardent, Vidyārāja, etc., is too seek a buddhahood that lies outside of the mind, the opposite of this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

as did all the Tantras and Sutras err in doing the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

The sūtras and tantras do not make that error at all.

As Kamalaśīla points out in his commentary on the Vajracchedika sūtra, "While the Tathāgata cannot be seen because by perfect marks, nevertheless, he can be seen through ultimate dharmatā."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

No-self is not a thing, it is a statement that something is without self, that is, a

permanent identity. Self, on the other hand, is the concept that there is a permanent identity.

Malcolm wrote:

You're completely ensnared into a dualism vis a vie self and no self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

Actually I was trying to make the point that the conclusion is not that simple.

Malcolm wrote:

It's pretty simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

That would simply mean that there is no conditioned, no compounded, no born, no transcended. And that would simply mean that all that is experienced is nothing but an illusion, a hallucination.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The core of the conditioned is unconditioned.

Sherab said:

So the core of the compounded is uncompounded, the core of the born is unborn, the core of the transcended is untranscended?

Malcolm wrote:

I agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

conebeckham said:

It doesn't operate through the mental consciousness, either, if I recall, as that is transformed into a wisdom....??

Malcolm wrote:

Sense organs means all six.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you are a follower of Madhyamaka.

Astus said:

I don't see how an independent awareness could fit into... Yogacara either.

Malcolm wrote:

There exists a detailed defense of reflexive cognition in Ratnakarashanti's Madhyamakālaṃkāra, not to mention the fact that epistemologists like Dharmakīrti extensively advance the idea.

Further in secret mantra it is stated that the wisdom of a tathāgata is a reflexive cognition, not only is it a reflexive cognition but it does not operate through sense organs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

A knowing/awareness cannot be experienced - only assumed - existing in and of itself. There is always something known, there is always a content of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you are a follower of Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

conebeckham said:

Indeed, Anjali, this is my understanding as well. I try to be a good Kagyupa, myself....

Per 3rd Karmapa's Mahamudra prayer, Mind does not "exist." But Mind cannot be said to be "nonexistent." This is Tantra, but let's forget that distinction for the moment. I think you can find plenty of Sutra and Shastra sources regarding Mind, or perhaps Mere Awareness. Consciousness at it's most basic level. A "Knowing."

I think this is the sort of thing that some folks equate with the "Great Self," though my readings thus far have made it clear to me that using "self" is a bit of a misnomer, and leads to a variety of problems, many of which are outlined here on this thread.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because the term bdag nyid chen po has a different connotation than those people who merely blindly translate things literally.

The term is carefully explained by Nubchen Sangye Yeshe to mean that all phenomena are included in the state of Samantabhadra. This then is the meaning of mahātman, bdag nyid chen po, in Dzogchen teachings in general.

In general, the way the term is used in sutras and tantras is as a title, i.e., "great persons", mahātmas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: when and where ? Chöd wang and lung

Content:

akatararyo said:

It is my understanding that the Chod from the Dudjom Tersar does not require empowerment to practice since there is no self-generation and T'hroma is visualized above your head.

Malcolm wrote:

You are going to find a lot of disagreement about that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I was not saying that shes rig becomes in the sense of arising. Merely that it becomes conditioned when it becomes involved in object imputation. The notion that shes rig is momentary depends on the conventional status of mind moments. Now granted, Sakya Pandita argues that timeless moments are immune to Madhyamaka reasonings, which according to him only apply to moments with temporal phases. This becomes very similar to the idea that shes rig is unconditioned because timeless moments would themselves be unconditioned with no possibility of any intervals between their instantiation. Of course we are then left with the quandary of what do to with timeless times. Sometimes in the Dzogchen texts you see reference to a fourth time, which is a state beyond the three times, past, present and future.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, this brings up a subject I've wanted to ask about for a long time, namely the nature of time in Buddhism generally, and Dzogchen in particular. It seems to me that a lot of what underlies the kind of argument you see in this thread is that we don't really understand what time is. Does Dzogchen have something distinctive to say about time?

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, time is not established of Nāgārjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Indrajala said:

In East Asia there was monasticism, sure, but it was quite different from the prescribed Indian model. Not quite "lay" but not really in line with the Vinaya either.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, a major difference too was that in Tibet there was already a strong ritualist class that took to the imported Indian rituals like ducks to water. These ritualists performed vital economic functions in the Tibetan economy such as warding off rain, hail, ensuring harvests and calves, etc., exorcising spirits connected with contagious illnesses, herbalism and so on. On the other hand, Monastics in Tibet had little to offer the lay population, since their main function was conducting state rites just like the kind of early Vajrayāna we see about the same time in Japan and China. When the monastic establishment failed in Central Tibet in the 840's, during the Asian economic downturn of the late Tang, the Buddhist ritualists in Tibet continued to provide valued services to the local populations. It was only after the monastic establishment began to integrate these local services and allied themselves with the aristocratic families like the Khon during the 11th century and so on that the populace really began to lend wholesale support to monastic establishment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, shes rig is unconditioned and timeless because time and conditions are not established in any way, but the fact of knowing awareness is indisputable, becoming conditioned only when it becomes entangled in dualistic cognitions.

dzogchungpa said:

I find statements like these very confusing. "When" would something timeless "become" at all?

Malcolm wrote:

I was not saying that shes rig becomes in the sense of arising. Merely that it becomes conditioned when it becomes involved in object imputation. The notion that shes rig is momentary depends on the conventional status of mind moments. Now granted, Sakya Pandita argues that timeless moments are immune to Madhyamaka reasonings, which according to him only apply to moments with temporal phases. This becomes very similar to the idea that shes rig is unconditioned because timeless moments would themselves be unconditioned with no possibility of any intervals between their instantiation. Of course we are then left with the quandary of what to do with timeless times. Sometimes in the Dzogchen texts you see reference to a fourth time, which is a state beyond the three times, past, present and future.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

If no, then what is your definition of "unconditioned" and "conditioned"?

Malcolm wrote:

I just stated at the outset that the conditioned and the unconditioned are not mutually exclusive.

The unconditioned and the conditioned, as I have already stated, are neither the same nor different.

The nature of the conditioned is non-arising. Whatever does not arise is unconditioned. Non-arising, unconditioned, suchness, etc., are all synonyms.

This is why Manjushri says "Whatever is dependently originated does not truly arise."

The core of the conditioned is unconditioned.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

“Nonabiding is without any fundamental [basis]. Mañjuśrī, all dharmas are established on the fundamental [basis] of nonabiding.”[/i]
(Vimalakirti Sutra, ch 7, p 126-127; tr. McRae)

Sherab said:

Understanding this is not as easy as it looks.

Malcolm wrote:

It just means that the "unconditioned and the conditioned" are in a nondual state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

If emptiness is equated with dependent origination, then if emptiness is unconditioned, dependent origination must also be unconditioned. If dependent origination is unconditioned, then causality must also be unconditioned. In other words, there is no cause for causality, which is a contradiction in terms.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is the nature of that which is dependently originated, that's all. What is the dependently originated empty of? All extremes. That emptiness is unconditioned. That emptiness is suchness. Suchness, by every definition is unconditioned. This being the case, as I said, the conditioned and the unconditioned are not mutually exclusive since the conditioned has an unconditioned nature.

The Samdhinirmocana has a nice explanation of how dharma and dharmatā are neither the same nor different.

M

conebeckham said:

But what about Bare Awareness? Im not speaking of "mind," as in consciousness, mindstream, but of the very awareness itself....it is taught, is it not, that this is

unconditioned? It is also taught that it is "empty."

Malcolm wrote:

There are two ways this can be sliced: the first way, the Sakya approach, is to assert that knowing awareness (shes rig) is relative and momentary, its emptiness is ultimate, and that the two are inseparable.

The second way to slice this is that time is predicated on objects (cf Vasubandhu) and that as objects are not established, time is not established (cf Nāgārjuna), leaving shes rig in an unconditioned state since it is not conditioned by objects (upon which imputations of time are dependent). In other words, shes rig is unconditioned and timeless because time and conditions are not established in any way, but the fact of knowing awareness is indisputable, becoming conditioned only when it becomes entangled in dualistic cognitions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Soreness in thighs.

Content:

philji said:

Any ideas or tips for dealing with pain and stiffness in thighs, especially after sitting. I have been doing more sitting of late but am noticing a real stiffness in my thigh muscles...hobbling around for a while like an old man...well I am quite old!!!!!!

Malcolm wrote:

light yoga, especially with postures held for several minutes like Paschimottasana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

The problem is that "vertical" dependence demands a starting point. The question then is: Is this starting point conditioned or unconditioned? If it is conditioned, then it cannot be the starting point. If it is unconditioned, how can it be the cause of all the others that is above it?

Malcolm wrote:

You are just falling into the same trap as Ardent and Co.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

If emptiness is equated with dependent origination, then if emptiness is unconditioned, dependent origination must also be unconditioned. If dependent origination is unconditioned, then causality must also be unconditioned. In other words, there is no cause for causality, which is a contradiction in terms.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is the nature of that which is dependently originated, that's all. What is the dependently originated empty of? All extremes. That emptiness is unconditioned. That emptiness is suchness. Suchness, by every definition is unconditioned. This being the case, as I said, the conditioned and the unconditioned are not mutually exclusive since the conditioned has an unconditioned nature.

The Samdhinirmocana has a nice explanation of how dharma and dharmatā are neither the same nor different.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 27th, 2013 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

mutsum said:

But my point was that the monks consider the Bon western sangha as made of apes (dixit for males) and cows (dixit for females) just good enough to pay for "retreats" (which in my opinion are often only a series of "conferences"...).

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is just standard Xenophobia.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

mutsum said:

tibetan monks are very rarely willing to share that ritual training.

Malcolm wrote:

Which, honestly speaking, is not freaking rocket science.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

You should say both Ardent and the Buddha romantically see the skandhas as a Mara. It would be more accurate Avuso.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, that is one view of the matter. Not the final word however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Sherab said:

This means that the real reality is that there is a relation between the ultimate and the relative, the transcendent and the mundane. That is why it is so difficult to get one's head around it.

Malcolm wrote:

The prajñāpāramitā solution is that the unconditioned and the conditioned are not mutually exclusive, in fact, the nature of the conditioned is unconditioned, and that is what emptiness basically means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Indrajala said:

In fact, I'd argue a lay priesthood is far more adaptable to changing circumstances than a monastic community is.

Malcolm wrote:

This is precisely the argument used in Tibetan history for the existence of sngags pas. When monks fled the chaos that ensued after Langdarma was assassinated for proposing to tax the monasteries, Buddhadharma primarily survived due to the interest of aristocratic Clans such as the Khon and so on in preserving Buddhist teachings within their families.

After China's economy stabilized in the late tenth century, and trade between Tibet and

China was no longer so disrupted, then the monastic community who had survived the travails of that epoch returned to Central Tibet and reestablished monasteries, encouraged by royal support.

The other factor too is that in Tibet, sngags pas are not really considered "lay" in the sense understood here in the West. They have undergone a kind of ordination, They have vows that are distinct from monastic vows, they also have garb to wear, etc. They are educated, which sets them apart from the average person and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, the problem as I see it is that line of reasoning employed by Ardent (Koji), VidyArAja, and so on is that unconditioned and conditioned phenomena are mutually exclusive.

For them the unconditioned is Self even if they cannot precisely say what that Self is (and they never seem to be able to).

Vidyārāja sees this self as the one who is aware (since he keeps asking who or what is aware of emptiness) -- this is very similar to the Samkhya based metaphysics of all the Hindu systems.

Ardent romantically sees the skandas as a mara (though how Ardent live with himself with such a negative view of his psychosomatic continuum is anyone's guess).

In other words, their view is very Manichaen, since they are addicted to an absolute dichotomy between the conditioned and unconditioned or Gnostic, in the sense that the material universe is evil and they are seekers of metanoia so they may return to the pleroma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Longde Teachings

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Does this mean that a person could get this and practice it?

Malcolm wrote:

It means they practice Nhondzog Gyalpo, not Longde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: wallowing

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Luke, I am not sure how standalone Vajrasattva practice normally works in Sakya, there is the 100 syllable mantra in some sadhana, but I do not know anyone who does it as a standalone thing...

Malcolm wrote:

You do the refuge, bodhicitta and then Vajraheruka, then dedication. It is pretty straight forward. Dezhung Rinpoche's text has a dedication specifically for people who are only working on that section.

If you have received any major Sakya empowerment such as Hevajra, etc., you already have the empowerment.

I did the entire Sakya ngondro and a three year retreat in the Sakya system, FYI.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

Dolpopa was very clear that the Buddhist Idea of True Self was not the same as the Forders....The problem he stated with the forders Idea of "Self" is that they considered impermanent things to be the Self....

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously, Dolbupa was completely ignorant of what non-Buddhists believed about "the self".

Son of Buddha said:

(I highlighted Blue on your very quote)they considered that which was not Noumena to be Noumena, and imputed what was impermanent to be that which is permanentin Dolpopas argument he states the the forders views did not actually contain the self of thusness,the pure self(ect)

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously Dolbupa erred in attributing truly existent characteristics to the signless.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Sat is what is veridical. Look to the meaning of the underlying ideas. From Gaudapada's verses on the Mandukya Upanisad:

Malcolm wrote:

It is also what is existent, for example, Samkhya is characterized as a satkaryavāda i.e. advocates (vāda) of production (karma) from an existent (sat).

There is a correspondence in Indian philosophy between what is veridical and what is existent. To deny this is to deny 3000 years of Indian thinking on the subject.

sat mf(%{satl4})n. (pr. p. of 1. %{as}) being , existing , occurring , happening , being present (%{sato@me} , ` " when I was present " ; often connected with other participles or with an adverb e.g. %{nAmni@kRte@sati} , ` " when the name has been given " ; %{tathA@sati} , ` " if it be so " ; also ibc. , where sometimes = ` " possessed of " cf. %{sat-kalpavRkSa}) RV. &c. &c. ; abiding in (loc.) MBh. ; belonging to (gen.) S3Br. ; living Mun2d2Up. ; lasting , enduring Ka1v. RV. &c. &c. ; real , actual , as any one or anything ought to be , true , good , right (%{tan@na@sat} , ` " that is not right ") , beautiful , wise , venerable , honest (often in comp. see below) RV. &c. &c. ; m. a being , (pl.) beings , creatures RV. &c. ; a good or wise man , a sage MBh. R. ; good or honest or wise or respectable people Mn. MBh. &c. ; (%{l4}) f. see %{sati4} below ; (%{sat}) n. that which really is , entity or existence , essence , the true being or really existent (in the Veda7nta , ` " the self-existent or Universal Spirit , Brahma ") RV. &c. &c. ; that which is good or real or true , good , advantage , reality , truth ib. ; water Naigh. i , 12 ; (in gram.) the terminations of the present participle Pa1n2. 3-2 , 127 &c. ; (%{sat}) ind. (cf. %{sat-kR} &c.) well , right , fitly. [Cf. Gk. \$ for \$; Lat. {sens} in &343162[1134 ,2] {absens} , {pra-sens} ; {sons} , ` " guilty " , orig. ` " the real doer " ; Lith. {sa1s} , {e4sas} ; Slav. {sy} , {sas8ta}.]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

anjali said:

Let's run with this. Unfortunately, I'm not very familiar with Gaudapada and his teachings. How does he characterize sat in his system of thought? A specific quote

would be very helpful, then we can take a look at how sat compares with emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty straightforward. In his Karikas he argues that if the ultimate is unreal, there cannot be any illusion of birth or actual birth using the example of a barren woman.

"The unreal cannot be born either really or through Māya. For the son of a barren woman is born neither in reality nor in illusion."

In other words, Gaudapada's theory of dualistic appearances depends on the reality of nondual brahman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Jikan said:

I don't speak business-ese and I'd like to give the good people at Tara Mandala the benefit of the doubt. Can anyone clarify what is meant by "competitiveness" in this context? Does it mean that the center is interested in ensuring that their rates & fees &c are priced at about the same level as other comparable centers? Or...?

Malcolm wrote:

I think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So, I don't really agree that all these systems are trying to get the same point, or have the same path, etc. As far as I can tell, Advaitans are climbing up one mountain, Buddhists are climbing a different mountain altogether.

dzogchungpa said:

One man's mountain is another man's valley, I always say.

Seriously though, which mountain are Dzogchenpas climbing?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Receive the advaita upadesha yourself and compare. Otherwise it is just so much comparing liquids based on the differences in the vessels which contain them. Of course the paths are different. After many years of practicing both, it's not so clear to me that there is much real difference in fruit.

Malcolm wrote:

Since the reduction of afflictions is the elementary point of both systems, I am perfectly content to grant that both systems provide the means the suppress afflictions.

I find the element of insight lacking in Hindu systems, as well as bodhicitta. There is no bodhicitta in Hindu systems of any sort whatsoever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

An aside, Nakamura in his important ground breaking work, A History of Early Vedanta Philosophy, has a lot to say about Buddhism and Vedanta. Buddhists should be cautious about asserting that some elements of Buddhism have been influenced by Vedanta. In the case of early Buddhism there was no Vedanta school. Also, Nakamura points out that "quite a few of the Vedanta lines have been greatly influenced by Buddhism, with Buddhist thought pervading them through and through"!

Malcolm wrote:

Oh lord, Ardent, you have not said one damn new thing in 18 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

But sat does not mean existent. Gaudapada was well acquainted with the tetralemma.

The reality of the matter is that ALL systems that posit a non-dual reality that is merely covered over by prapancha are just different philosophical franchises serving up the same tasty patties of ground beef and batons of deep-fried potato, whether on the one hand the cipher used is "emptiness" or on the other hand "Brahman". Their various brands, trademarks, hermeneutical approaches and excuses for why they are right and the other guy is wrong speak only to the different habituations of those to be tamed. One doesn't have to be a perennialist to see this.

Malcolm wrote:

What non-dual means in Buddhadharma is really quite different than what it means say to Sankara and even Gaudapada. Gaudapada may have been sympathetic towards Mahāyāna philosophy, and in the Agamasāstra he indiscriminately cribbed yogacara and madhyamaka arguments to refute Samkhya and Vaśeśika and so on.

What nisprapañca means is also different in these systems.

So, I don't really agree that all these systems are trying to get the same point, or have the same path, etc. As far as I can tell, Advaitans are climbing up one mountain, Buddhists are climbing a different mountain altogether.

Apart from a common agreement that kleśas are what is responsible for transmigration, I don't see these systems as having much in common in terms of how they present the basis, the path and the result.

Also I really don't agree that brahman = śūnyatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

anjali said:

What is the status of the Self's existence? Would you characterize the Self as existent, non-existent, both or neither? Would you characterize it as empty?

Lotus_Bitch said:

In non-dualist philosophies such as Kashmiri Shaivism and Advaita Vedanta respectively: Shiva and Brahman are beyond existence, non-existence, both existence and non-existence and neither existence nor non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

I think this is not really correct. Brahman is ajati because it is unconditioned. It is considered beyond existence and non-existence only in the sense of being conditioned. It is sat, meaning real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Nonetheless, I think what I quoted by Dolpopa on the previous page is quite clearly not the popular no-self notion.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you really understand the citation you cited. I think you lack sufficient education in the hermeneutics of the tantras upon which Dolbupa's entire position is predicated.

Basically, what you have admitted to is that you are merely incorporating some Buddhist masters [you poorly understand] into an over all perennialist agenda. You initiated this by attacking someone whose views you regarded as "heretical" barely even considering that the vast majority of Buddhists would consider your perspective equally outside the pale of Buddhadharma, which it is, by your own admission.

You are a perennialist eclectic, which is fine and dandy, but don't confuse your philosophical tastes with Buddhadharma, for they are not the same.

It would also be good if you learned some humility and stopped pretending you were an expert in teachings which you cannot read in a primary language.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Not who I am in the sense that it isn't my name-form-memories-thoughts or not who I am in the ultimate sense? The Atman isn't personal, but supra-personal, so there is no grasping to self in that sense. Nonetheless, it is the nondual ground of all there is and Tat Tvam Asi.

Malcolm wrote:

If there is a nondual ground of all there is in Mahāyāna, it is emptiness. Not some divine pleroma. In the Nikayas, Buddha explicitly denies the existence of any such ground.

As he was sitting there, he said to the Blessed One, "Now, then, Master Gotama, does everything [2] exist?"

"Everything exists' is the senior form of cosmology, brahman."

"Then, Master Gotama, does everything not exist?"

"Everything does not exist' is the second form of cosmology, brahman."

"Then is everything a Oneness?"

"Everything is a Oneness' is the third form of cosmology, brahman."

"Then is everything a Manyness?"

"Everything is a Manyness' is the fourth form of cosmology, brahman. Avoiding these two extremes, the Tathagata teaches the Dhamma via the middle:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn12/sn12.048.than.html>

Vidyaraja said:

Therefore, the ultimate [reality] in all profound sutras and tantras which finely present thusness, and so forth, is empty of other, never empty of self-nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Dolbupa would be horrified to think that you had so misunderstood his writing. He writes:

"Since the matrix-of-the-one gone-thus is empty of the two selves, it is not similar to the self of the formers, and because uncompounded noumena transcends the momentary, it is permanent, stable, and everlasting. It is not that it, like space, is without any of the qualities, powers, and aspects of a buddha, and it is not like the self of persons that the formers impute to be permanent."

Mountain Doctrine, ppg. 118-119.

But you, from the beginning of this discussion have asserted that the other emptiness asserted by Dolbupa is exactly the affirmation of the atman of the Vedantins and so on.

This is why I say you have no idea what Dolbupa's actual perspective is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Is this clarity who I really am? Have you directly realized this clarity and therefore can say for certain that it is empty of Self, or are you going by the philosophy of others?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not who you are, since it is empty of all extremes. It is who you are since it is the

basis of designating a person. We have an experience of clarity all the time. It is when we mistake the reflections in it for itself, that we reify outer objects as real. When we mistaken it for being a self, or a person, we engage atmagraha, grasping a self.

As it is said in many sutras and tantras, there is no buddhahood outside of the mind.

Vidyaraja said:

Seems that a large number of Buddhists (who incidentally buy into the no-self doctrine) are depressed, self-hating, and mentally unstable.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really know any Buddhist like that. But I think that people who hang around religion groups in general usually have a lot of issues.

Vidyaraja said:

I think the vision of ultimate truth as expressed Dolpopa or various Hindu sages is a happy one.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I am very convinced by now that you haven't the slightest inkling of what Dolbupa really thinks or why he wrote what he did.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 26th, 2013 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Burning the seed of existence as applying to the empirical self which allows one to transcend the triple realm isn't the same burning away the ultimate Self.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically you erred in the same way all the great mystics outside Buddhadharma have erred. You have mistaken clarity for a self, without realizing that clarity too is empty.

Vidyaraja said:

You said previously that non-conceptual wisdom apprehends emptiness, but what is this non-conceptual wisdom and is it aware? What is the relation between us and this non-conceptual wisdom?

Malcolm wrote:

Nonconceptual wisdom replaces consciousness when knowledge obscurations are total eradicated. If you want to understand how this works, read the Mahāyāna Saṃgraha by Asanga which clearly explains how the aggregates transform into the four

wisdoms.

Some people assert Buddhas cognize normally [Gelug] others assert that Buddhas are free from all cognitions and that their acts are totally spontaneous.

Vidyaraja said:

According this line of thought, two options are available, the reality of some part of me (like awareness or transcendent Self) and suffering, or my negation and absence to be free from suffering?

Malcolm wrote:

You clearly do not understand the purpose of the two truths.

Vidyaraja said:

Yes, it is only my opinion, but as pointed out also the opinion of most of world's sages including Hindu yogis and Buddhist masters like Dolpopa, so I think I am in good company.

Malcolm wrote:

Misery loves company.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Those that do deny the Self I believe are primarily philosophers working with a system of thought, not realized yogis attempting to communicate their experiential realization of deathlessness.

Malcolm wrote:

In your opinion. Others vigorously disagree with your assertion, as do the vast majority of Mahāyāna sutras. How the tathāgatagarbha sutras (a very minor part of the Mahāyāna canon) are to be read is a bit of a contentious issue -- suffice it to say that the commentary on them reads like a standard Madhyamaka text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Now this is only relevant to me of course due to being intertwined with personal experience, but beyond that I think the universality and descriptive proximity of all the

world's sages is more of an objective confirmation of the Self being Truth than the exclusive and minority position of the no-self Buddhists. To accept the latter also entails maintaining the falsity of the rest (or at least lower level, incomplete enlightenment) which isn't something I believe in either.

Malcolm wrote:

The falsity of the rest is something repeatedly stated in the Pali canon and throughout the history of Buddhist critiques of other systems.

In brief, since they never burn the seed of existence because of their extreme views of self, they never get out of the triple realm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that Buddha was aware, indeed, knowledgeable in Samkhya since it was the system taught by Arāda.

Aśvaghoṣa clearly describes Arāda as being a follower of Kapila, and gives an account of the basics of the Samkhya system in Canto 12...

dzogchungpa said:

Is that the main evidence that the Buddha was familiar with Samkhya?

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Man, it is a real shame for Buddhist philosophy and soteriology if the no-Self doctrine is the actual doctrinal position as its supporters maintain for, if such is truly the case, then Buddhism is a false doctrine. Though at least it would prove that even false doctrines can produce realized sages under the right conditions (such as Dolpopa or those Thai figures who equate nibbana and atta.)

Malcolm wrote:

The teaching of the Buddha is just dependent origination, not self, not no-self.

Sariputra quotes the Buddha:

Whoever sees dependent co-arising sees the Dhamma; whoever sees the Dhamma sees dependent co-arising.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.028.than.html>

And the Buddha said:

He who sees Dhamma, Vakkali, sees me; he who sees me sees Dhamma. Truly seeing Dhamma, one sees me; seeing me one sees Dhamma.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn22/sn22.087x.wlsh.html>

Emptiness of a self as well as the absence of intrinsic identity in phenomena, is merely a consequence of dependent origination.

It is very clear, for example, that the tathāgatagarbha doctrine was swiftly marginalized in mainstream Mahāyāna circles. We can see this by virtue of the fact that the Lankāvatara sūtra clearly describes the ālayavijñāna as being the tathāgatagarbha. There exists but two commentaries devoted to tathāgatagarbha doctrine in the bstan 'gyur.

In general, tathāgatagarbha doctrine becomes more prominent in Vajrayāna for various reasons beyond the scope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Please share your thoughts on this.

Indrajala said:

Tibetan Buddhism in the west could introduce democratic federations which manage common retreat centers for everyone to use. The democracy means, ideally, egalitarianism and neutrality when it comes to lineages and gurus.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, it is McDonald's vs. Burger King thinking. They are all selling burgers and fries, but they all want you to think their burgers and fries are the best.

Here is the breakdown.

McDonalds =- Gelugpas

Burger King = Kagyus

Wendy's = Sakya

KFC/Taco Bell = Nyingma

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Astus said:

The Buddha rejected the interpretation that there is a self outside the aggregates, and some assumed this is somehow related to Samkhya (<http://www.accesstinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.022.than.html#fn-8>). Although I don't think it really matters whether Samkhya was known or not, as their views don't fit the Buddha's teachings anyway.

Koji said:

There is no passage in the nikayas that states, unambiguously, the Buddha "rejected the interpretation that there is a self outside the aggregates." To assert such is also to assert there is nothing outside or beyond the five murderous aggregates (S.iii.114) which also happen to be Mara the killer (S.iii.189). Neither the Buddha nor his disciples identified their self with the aggregates anymore then they might identify their self with a burning pile of grass, twigs, branches and foliage.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Ardent:

Isn't boring to rehash arguments we had on AOL?

Vasubandhu (cf. Poussin/Pruden) quotes several sources from the Agamas having stated his thesis at the outset:

"There is neither direct perception nor inference of a soul (atman) independent of the skandhas. We know then that a real soul does not exist."

He then cites his authorities such as the Bimbisāra sūtra:

"A stupid ignorant Prthagjana becomes attached to words, and he imagines there is a self; but there is no self nor things pertaining to a self, but only past, present and future painful dharmas".

He cites another, also cited in the Sūtrālaṃkāra:

"Five calamities proceed from the belief in a soul(atman): one creates a theory of a soul, of a being, of a vital principle, one is not distinguished from heterodox teachers...: etc. Even the tathāgatarbha sūtras take great pains to differentiate their "atman" from the atman posited by Pudgalavadins and Hindus because the tatāgatarbha is merely a gloss for dharmatā.

For example, Ārya-tathāgatarbha-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

Whether or not that dharmatā of dharmas produces tathāgatas, these sentient beings always contain tathāgatarbha.

Now, depending on what you understand dharmatā to mean, then you will understand this in that light. But since there can be no dharmatā without dharmas, it is ludicrous to

say this if this tathagātagarbha is other than the aggregates it is also the nature of the aggregates.

Personally, my impression of the main message of the tathagatagarbha sutras is that people should not feel awakening is beyond their capacity. For example, is how this passage from the Tathāgatagarbha sūtra reads:

"Sons of a good family, in the same way all sentient beings are without protection, are tormented with the sufferings of samsara, abiding in a house without a protector, the place of birth in the world. Now, the family of tathagatas exists in all sentient beings, but those it exists in them, those sentient being do not comprehend this.

Sons of a good family, because the Tathāgata do not malign sentient being themselves, sons of good family, you yourselves must not be disheartened, and have firm diligence! There will come a time when the Tathāgata enters into you and you will enter into the ranks of the bodhisattvas and will not be called "sentient beings". Further, when you have entered the ranks of the buddhas, you will not be called "bodhisattvas".

And:

It was taught, "Sentient beings who do not understand dharmatā, do not generate the thought of 'I am inferior'!"

You must set out with firm diligence,
your own body will become a victor without long delay.

Once one has obtained the heart of awakening,
one will be able to liberate 10,000,000,000 creatures.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

smcj said:

otherwise you get every Tom, Dick and Harry wearing robes and parroting something they have heard ...

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm and how is this different than the present state of Tibetan Buddhism, apart from that fact that their names are Tashi, Dondrup and Phuntsog?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

smcj said:

The massive resentment many, if not most of us, have towards institutional religion isn't even on their radar, for the most part.

Malcolm wrote:

It is, but they ridicule it, thinking our antipathy towards organized religion is about God, when instead our antipathy towards organized religion is really more about money and power.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Pande concludes by saying,

"It appears that Sāṅkhya influence on Buddhism has been too lightly assumed" (p. 551).

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that Samkhya was a major influence of Buddhism, did I? No.

What I said was that Buddha was aware, indeed, knowledgeable in Samkhya since it was the system taught by Arāda.

Aśvaghoṣa clearly describes Arāda as being a follower of Kapila, and gives an account of the basics of the Samkhya system in Canto 12 (truly required reading for everyone participating in this discussion).

So, frankly, I think Aśvaghoṣa is a more reliable source than Pande, don't you, Ardent?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 25th, 2013 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well.....is it the students, or the teachers, who foster this sort of thing? That is the primary question you should ask yourself.

And when you've reached your conclusions, consider your alternatives.

Malcolm wrote:

In my experience, it is the teachers, mostly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Parochialism in the West

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I have been giving a lot of thought lately to how we as Tibetan Buddhists spend our limited resources in the West. It seems that instead of cooperating with each other to share teaching and retreat facilities, we are repeating the same balkanized organizational structures as in Tibet and the Tibetan diaspora and actually approaching other groups as competition. This to my mind is entirely counterproductive. While there are bigger differences with other forms of Buddhism from other countries, one would think that the schools are close enough to cooperate more closely in the West than they have. Instead we see even lineages within the same school competing.

Please share your thoughts on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Turf war.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Tattoos

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Any idea if he got these pre- or post-Chinese invasion, before or after going into exile? Not that it really matters, simply curious.

By the by, I've heard the eternal knot referred to as the Tibetan form of the swastika. Does anyone know if that is accurate, or is it just a bunch of hokum?

Malcolm wrote:

In the fifties, I assume, when he was mainly in Derge studying with Jamyang Khentse Chokyi Lodo.

Hokum.

Swastikas are called gyung drung in Tibetan, as in gyung drung bon. Eternal knots are called dpal be'u. dPal be'u is a translation of śrīvatsa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Westerner who really makes it work at Sera

Content:

JKhedrup said:

LOL Malcolm it wasn't my answer, it was the Rikchung's answer. I thought your point

made sense, and so asked Geshe la out of curiosity, he replied with the original answer posted above, which I bolded again, making clear both were necessary in his opinion from the beginning.

In Geshe la's answer he mentions both these imprints from the beginning, so your statement about any being born in the deva realm having sufficient causes for arousing bodhicitta was a bit of a stretch. You cannot really reasonably draw that conclusion from what G. said, as he mentions both CA and BC in his answer. That's all I'm sayin'.

If the requirement of Shinay for the arising of Bodhicitta is something debatable, that would be something to explore. Perhaps there are different views across the traditions,

Malcolm wrote:

I meant in the form realms, actually. The mind of any being in the form realm is concentrated to a degree extraordinary to a human being.

In any event, I think there is a problem of infinite regress in this argument in general. That is why I brought up the Buddha in hell point. This is traditionally where it is considered that Buddha first aroused bodhicitta. But of course it is a myth, and as such subject to interpretations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

It depends on what one believes he wrote. In the Maha-prajnaparamita-shastra N appears to have affirmed the âtman.

"People who understand the meaning (artha) of the Buddhist doctrine and know the designation (prajñapti [Pali, paññatti]) say that the âtman exists. People who do not understand the meaning of the Buddhist doctrine and do not know the designation say that the âtman does not exist."

Malcolm wrote:

This simply means that "the self" exists simply as a designation, not that there is a real atman. A real atman would exist without a designation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Right now a hot debate rages in Thailand among Theravadins, between those who assert

nirvana is anatta and those who assert nirvana is atta. The atta side appears to be winning.

dzogchungpa said:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/115896892/Cholvijarn-Nibbana-As-Self-or-Not-Self-181>

Malcolm wrote:

Regarding Phae Tissadevo's position:

The anattā doctrine is only founding in Buddhism because the Buddha realised attā that is different from conditioned dhammas.

It is pretty clear this Sangharāja never studied Samkhya since in fact that is exactly what the Samkhya/Yoga schools maintains, that self or purusha is completely other than consciousness, senses, sense objects and the material body i.e. the twenty four tattvas (prakṛti, buddhi, ahaṁkāra, manas, the five organs, five organs of action, the five subtle elements [tanmatras] and the five gross elements).

If an atman is what one wants to find, then there is no better system of finding it than Samkhya/Yoga.

Of course, Buddha was quite familiar with Samkhya, but for some reason did not present it in his teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Tattoos

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dagchen Rinpoche used to have a Swastika tattooed on the back of his left hand above his thumb. When he arrived here in the US, people freaked out so he had it covered with a bird.

Karma Jinpa said:

Would this happen to be HH Jigdral Dagchen Rinpoche, the high lama in Sakya who consecrated the Tibet Tech prayer wheels?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. He still has an eternal knot on the same place on his right hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

I don't deny internal policing existed before. I'm saying I feel it is increasing over time.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you would have found 1930's US pretty damn oppressive, especially if you were in a union.

The US has always reacted to perceived external threats with invasions of privacy. Modern technology just makes it easier to accomplish and more cost effective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

That doesn't negate the possibility we're seeing increased policing in the west. I don't mean cops on the ground arresting burglars, but behind the scenes surveillance and suppression of dissenting voices.

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sedition_Act_of_1918

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Tattoos

Content:

ngodrup said:

My precious Root Lama, who was born, raised and completed his training and practice in Old Tibet-- was also very traditional, to say the least. This very old school Nyingma yogi had a very small tattoo, clearly visible to anybody who looked close enough-- a swastika. So we cannot say that it was not done.

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dagchen Rinpoche used to have a Swastika tattooed on the back of his left hand above his thumb. When he arrived here in the US, people freaked out so he had it covered with a bird.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Tantric Tattoos

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Wondering what various people have heard or experienced regarding Vajrayana subject matter as body art.

I've had different responses depending on the lama I asked... Most Karma Kagyu I'm in contact with have seemed to be ok with the idea as long as my motivation is pure. One Drikungpa said it was ok, but not necessary. Another Drikungpa said it is never ok to purposely harm one's body, and that I should do 1 million Tara mantras instead.

A translator friend warned that getting such tattoos opens one up for harm by demons, specifically those very hostile to the Dharma. Basically it puts a bullseye on ya.

What have you folks heard?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a practitioner of completion stage practices, one Dzogchen manual advises against receiving moxabustion or bloodletting treatments (including acupuncture needles). Tattoos are a form of bloodletting. So, if you are a serious completion stage practitioner, then I would say it is better not to get tattoos. If you are not a completion stage practitioner, then just make sure the tattoo artist is hygienic. It is better if they also are a Dharma person.

Further, do not get tattoos of Dharma themes below the waist, on one's left hand (since that is the one most people in Asia wipe with) and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

I've never studied Theosophy before

Malcolm wrote:

Which is why you don't recognize it in Rhys Davies, Grimm and Coomaraswamies, etc., writings.

Koji said:

This is the no-selfer theosophical ploy which is a kind of ad hominem fallacy. It doesn't

mean Mrs. Rhys Davids, I.B. Horner, Pande, Frauwallner, and the rest are dead wrong. Right now a hot debate rages in Thailand among Theravadins, between those who assert nirvana is anatta and those who assert nirvana is atta. The atta side appears to be winning.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma is not sports, though some people seem to treat it as such.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A mind or an awareness [shes pa] has a "choice" recognition or non-recognition. The recognizing mind is called vidyā or prajñā. The non-recognizing mind is called avidyā.

conebeckham said:

"A mind" or "an awareness" --are these momentary awarenesses? Is it the case that there is a moment of vidyā, followed by a moment of avidyā? Are preceding and subsequent moments of vidyā and avidyā related?

Malcolm wrote:

Not really momentary in the sense we normally think of term, however, yes, vidyā is by definition a moment of unfabricated awareness. Vidyā and avidyā are related since they can be based on the same continuum.

There are two kinds of Buddhahood in Dzogchen, abhisambodhi, which has a non-abiding nirvana; samyaksambodhi which enters nirvana without remainder.

I assume this to be the difference between temporary "abiding" in Rigpa, and the complete eradication of avidyā?

It is the difference between bringing one's practice of Dzogchen to a complete finish in this life or not.

Omniscience arises because the capacity for omniscience is present in the form of potential in the basis.

In order for "capacity" to be present in something, even as potential, doesn't that "something" have to "exist?" In Mahamudra terms, we would say, I think, that it is precisely due to the empty nature of Dharmakaya that such omniscience is possible. In other words, the empty nature of the basis is equivalent to it's "capacity" for anything whatsoever.

[/quote]

No, if that were the case, Dzogchen would be no different than Samkhya. A useful referent is the Sakya concept that lhun grub and gnas 'gyur, natural formation and transformation, are not mutually exclusive. Potentiality can be just as well explained

through emptiness as it can existence, even more easily actually. In general, there is a discussion of the three kāyas of the basis i.e. emptiness, clarity and their inseparability. Because these are present as the basis, the three kāyas can manifest at the time of the result, since their base exists in the basis. But this does not mean that the three kāyas of the basis are identical with the three kāyas of the result. The basis is called the basis precisely because of nonrealization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Are you sure that you are presenting an assertion of Nāgārjuna's? Or a position that he is going to dismantle? Check carefully, you wouldn't want to make a mistake.

Koji said:

It seems that your are suggesting that Nagarjuna is likely to contradict himself in another verse saying, essentially, "Nirvana is of the created realm" or "Nirvana is abhava."

Malcolm wrote:

No, what I am suggesting is that Nāgārjuna's Mūla presents both an opponent's contention and his own refutation and you have to know which is which to properly read him. The reason why Kalupahana's translation is a disaster is that he chose to ignore this. So I am suggesting that you discover this then you will have answered your own question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

I've never studied Theosophy before

Malcolm wrote:

Which is why you don't recognize it in Rhys Davies, Grimm and Coomaraswamies, etc., writings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism by Peter Harvey. If you do not read this, it is really hard to take anything you say about this seriously. It will simply appear as if you are engaging in confirmation bias.

He systematically goes through all the claims your are fond of claiming are grounded in the Pali canon and dismembers them one by one.

Vidyaraja said:

How do you know you weren't engaged in confirmation bias while reading that book and finding it to be true? One can only be taken seriously if they've read this particular book and accepted the authors conclusions? I'll look into it though, thanks for the recommendation.

Malcolm wrote:

Because I am a pretty objective scholar who spends my time weeding away what is not present in the texts I am reading.

Vidyaraja said:

There is a difference between irrational and supra-rational. One can be logical or an accomplished logician but also maintain that truth can't be captured by logic or concepts and can only be directly intuited with our spiritual eye.

Malcolm wrote:

It is irrational to claim that with a map you cannot find a city. What you do not want to do is merely be content with possessing the map without making the journey, but an accurate map is essential to the success of any journey.

You are just mixing everything up into one big stew so you don't know if one minute you are chewing on Theosophy, the next minute Zen, the minute after that Vedanta, then slurping a bit of Dolbupa, etc.

I've never studied Theosophy before, but I don't see why a totalistic view of all Buddhism or all human spiritual endeavor and comparing and contrasting between various views should not prove a fruitful exercise. Either way, in general I agree with Frithjof Schuon about the variety of views:

You aren't comparing between different views -- you are merely changing the color of the light you want to look at.

Buddhadharma is radically different than other traditions. Our view at base is dependent origination. As the Buddha said "He who sees dependent origination, sees the Dharma". There is no room for an ultimate transcendent nirvana, self, etc., except as a provisional view for those afraid of emptiness, as stated in the Lanka-avatara sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Westerner who really makes it work at Sera

Content:

JKhedrup said:

No I don't think so, because the imprints of both the Shinay and bodhicitta must be present, this is clear from the answer. And the imprints for bodhicitta are more difficult to cultivate, many practitioners of different paths attain different levels of calm abiding, bodhicitta is far rarer.

I have heard mentioned by Geshe la and several other masters that BSM was able to arouse Bodhicitta in the hell realm only because of extensive cultivation of love, compassion and so forth in previous lifetimes. The arousing of bodhicitta in hell is extremely rare, most beings give rise to it in the human realm. I would think the imprints for Shinay are far more common, since many beings have at some point been born in the Devas realms that require its cultivation.

Since BSM arising of BC required both these imprints (compassion etc. as well as Shinay), I don't think you can draw that conclusion from what Geshe la said. Because in these deva realms most beings are not cultivating BC. It is clear that both are required, one isn't enough, as G. indicated in his answer:

Just as the imprints for bodhicitta were there, which allowed it to be arisen from hell from witnessing the suffering there, a level of calm abiding had been attained in a previous life.

Malcolm wrote:

Even Rakshasas love their children, so I find their answer a bit hard to accept. But that is not what I am objecting too. I am objecting to the idea that śamatha is a necessary precondition to the arousal of bodhicitta. Now you are answering that imprints for both must be present. So you are shifting your answer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is both, and the former will lead to the latter, which is why Āryadeva proclaimed "Realization proceeds from view." This is why there is such a huge emphasis on developing a correct view in sūtrayāna. Whereas in Vajrayāna in general, the view is taught only after empowerment, because the view cultivated in Vajrayāna should be cultivated on the basis of the experience produced during one of the empowerments (but the Gelugpas have a different perspective on this).

Vidyaraja said:

It isn't both, because I didn't ask if both were needed or useful. Rather I asked whether logic and concepts could ever capture truth, not whether they could lead to truth along with spiritual practice. What is a right view can only be truly confirmed through awakening and seeing things how they really are, not relying on the logical structures built by others, which are merely an aid or a single wing of a bird (the other being practice) in flight toward truth.

Malcolm wrote:

It is both, because in order to realize a thing, you need to be able to talk about.

This is very clearly explained by _all_ Indo-tibetan scholars including Dolbupa. He does not subscribe to your irrational mysticism at all. He is a very logical scholar, who goes step by step in presenting his logical, rational, carefully argued view because he wants people to use that as the basis of realizing the ultimate.

You are just mixing everything up into one big stew so you don't know if one minute you are chewing on Theosophy, the next minute Zen, the minute after that Vedanta, then slurping a bit of Dolbupa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They are dreaming. Such a doctrine exists nowhere in the Nikayas.

Vidyaraja said:

That's your opinion and your view. The various scholars mentioned previously as well as various figures in Thai Buddhism for example hold a different view. While you certainly know your stuff, you'll have to excuse me if I don't take you as a superior authority to them.

Malcolm wrote:

You know, you really need to read this book -- it will set your ideas about the Pali canon to rest completely.

The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism by Peter Harvey. If you do not read this, it is really hard to take anything you say about this seriously. It will simply appear as if you are engaging in confirmation bias.

He systematically goes through all the claims your are fond of claiming are grounded in the Pali canon and dismembers them one by one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

In any case, is truth able to be captured by logic or concepts, or is it supra-rational and beyond concepts? Is it knowable through reasoning, or must one awakening to it through kensho and satori as the Zen tradition would have it?

Malcolm wrote:

It is both, and the former will lead to the latter, which is why Āryadeva proclaimed "Realization proceeds from view." This is why there is such a huge emphasis on developing a correct view in sūtrayāna. Whereas in Vajrayāna in general, the view is taught only after empowerment, because the view cultivated in Vajrayāna should be cultivated on the basis of the experience produced during one of the empowerments (but the Gelugpas have a different perspective on this).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Malcolm, earlier you spoke about an "eternalist vision of nirvana" (Wed Sep 18, 2013 6:31 am). I am just wondering what an eternalist vision of nirvana is, exactly. Would it be outside of the realm of existence and non-existence?

Malcolm wrote:

The eternalist vision of nirvana that nirvana is as an unconditioned state to be realized, like brahman.

The non-eternalist view of nirvana (erroneously considered annihilationist in some quarters) is that nirvana is the permanent cessation of afflictions which lead to rebirth in samsara, leading to cessation of birth in samsara.

Koji said:

I read you as saying an unconditioned nirvana, like the Hindu brahman, is the eternalist vision of nirvana which, incidentally, is a view that you believe we must reject. But it is hard for me to wrap my mind around this let alone accept it when I have read from other sources like Nagarjuna's MMK, that nirvana is of the uncreated realm (XXV.13) which is different that the created realm of existence and non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you sure that you are presenting an assertion of Nāgārjuna's? Or a position that he is going to dismantle? Check carefully, you wouldn't want to make a mistake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What about it? First of all, we have to understand the basis is empty, not just empty, since it is also clear but that emptiness is profound. This is fundamental in Dzogchen. Rig pa is not some permanent transcendent awareness. There is a point in time in which rig pa has not arisen, prior to the realization producing buddhas and nonrealization producing sentient beings. But this is a little outside the scope. Basically vidyā is just the mind that knows the appearance of the display as its own appearances. Avidyā is the mind that does not know that. Simple as pie.

conebeckham said:

I'd like to know more about the point in time prior to Rigpa's arising..but agree that's outside the scope.

The statement about vidyā and Avidyā, though.....there is the same "mind" that knows or does not know? Or are we speaking of momentary "minds"-and what of the Enlightened Ones, who abide permanently in vidyā? Or do they?

Malcolm wrote:

A mind or an awareness [shes pa] has a "choice" recognition or non-recognition. The recognizing mind is called vidyā or prajñā. The non-recognizing mind is called avidyā.

There are two kinds of Buddhahood in Dzogchen, abhisambodhi, which has a non-abiding nirvana; samyaksambodhi which enters nirvana without remainder.

Omniscience arises because the capacity for omniscience is present in the form of potential in the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

My understanding of Prasangika Mahdyamika (and someone please correct if i'm wrong) is not that it claims Nirvana is non-existence or something similar, it simply claims that inherent existence of anything is not findable, and it stops there, there is no underlying implication of inherent non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is the Sautrantikas following tenets who assert that nirvana is a nonexistent.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I don't get it Malcolm, so it's correct that Prasangika does not make statements about ultimate reality, or it is incorrect?

Malcolm wrote:

They do not use syllogisms to prove emptiness. They use consequences. For example, "Production from self is meaningless and the series will be endless." This the classical example of prasanga argumentation, argument by means of demonstrating consequences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Yes, nirvana is supra-personal, but it is also awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

This is stated in no sūtra.

Vidyaraja said:

There was a thread on this forum called Mind vs. Self in which a few users argued quite successfully in my opinion, using citations from various scriptures including the Nikayas, for the transcendent Self. Many other intelligent scholars as well as Buddhist masters (like Dolpopa mentioned frequently in this thread) have also maintained this view. I don't think their conclusions were reached without long study or careful consideration and thus can't be said to be simply dreaming.

Malcolm wrote:

They are dreaming. Such a doctrine exists nowhere in the Nikayas.

Dolbupa was a Vajrayāna scholar first and foremost, and the majority of his views are derived from the way in which he read the three bodhisattva commentaries on Kalacakra, Hevajra, and Cakrasamvara respectively authored by Mañjuśrī, Vajragarbha, and Avalokiteśvara according to tradition.

Vidyaraja said:

Though I wonder, why are you hardline in your position that any Self is wrong and all the trends in Buddhism which have maintained it are in error, but soft and accepting of Stephen Batchelor's materialistic secular Buddhism as part of the Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

I think Batchelor is as wrong as you are. I accept his presence in Buddhism as I accept yours, both with views in need of correction since both you and he are porting views into Buddhadharma from external sources, in your case Vedanta/Neoplatonism; in his case, secular materialism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Westerner who really makes it work at Sera

Content:

JKhedrup said:

You are on the ball Malcolm... I think it is a very reasonable qualm so I asked Geshe SN what he thought of it while bringing his evening drink.

Geshe la said the Rikchung candidate was correct, in asserting calm abiding/shinay was necessary for the attainment of bodhicitta.

How then, does one explain Lord Shakyamuni's arousing of bodhicitta in the hell realms?

Geshe la certainly a new attainment of Shinay would not be possible in the hell realms, especially when one looks at the texts and the various conditions that are required for Shinay. However, the shinay had been achieved to some degree in a previous life. Just as the imprints for bodhicitta were there, which allowed it to be arisen from hell from witnessing the suffering there, a level of calm abiding had been attained in a previous life. This attainment does not necessarily carry over from rebirth to rebirth, but in this case it did.

So, Shakyamuni was able to bring forth the Shinay necessary to arise bodhicitta despite the difficult conditions of the hell realm.

Would love to explore this further but further input from Geshe la would have to wait until breakfast (European time).

Malcolm wrote:

I think your Geshes answer is speculative at best. It amounts to saying that anyone who had attained rebirth in a deva realm has the sufficient causes for arousing bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

My understanding of Prasangika Mahdyamika (and someone please correct if i'm wrong) is not that it claims Nirvana is non-existence or something similar, it simply claims that inherent existence of anything is not findable, and it stops there, there is no underlying implication of inherent non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is the Sautrantikas following tenets who assert that nirvana is a nonexistent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No such supreme seer is discussed in the sūtras. Buddhas, possessors of non-abiding nirvana, are held to possess two kinds of omniscience. But this omniscience is held to arise from a cause. As Kamalashila points out, omniscience must have a cause, otherwise it would arise randomly at all times and in every place. Even Dolbupa does not deny the need for conventionally gathering the two accumulations.

conebeckham said:

I understand we're trying to talk about "Early Buddhism and Mahayana" here, but you yourself have brought Dzogchen into the picture (It's perhaps "Mahayana" in some sense....maybe?) ---I understand the sutras don't discuss a "Supreme Seer," but what about Dzogchen and Rigpa? What about the Natural State, and it's relation to omniscience, and it's relation to causation?

Malcolm wrote:

What about it? First of all, we have to understand the basis is empty, not just empty, since it is also clear but that emptiness is profound. This is fundamental in Dzogchen. Rig pa is not some permanent transcendent awareness. There is a point in time in which rig pa has not arisen, prior to the realization producing buddhas and nonrealization producing sentient beings. But this is a little outside the scope. Basically vidyā is just the mind that knows the appearance of the display as it own appearances. Avidyā is the mind that does not know that. Simple as pie.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

If Madhyamika were mere apophatic or via negative approach to reality in order to help us to awaken (which is what I feel it is or should be) that would be one thing, but it seems many people assert that the ultimate or nirvana is emptiness, anatta, and not eternal.

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is permanent (since cessations are by definition unconditioned), but it also lacks identity since there is no person in nirvana. There are no aggregates in nirvana.

Vidyaraja said:

so equally how can these Madhyamikist's statements about the ultimate be accepted merely through intellectual satisfaction or the result of logical analysis?

Malcolm wrote:

How can your irrational assertions about the nature of the ultimate be acceptable? What Madhyamakas produce is an analytical ultimate. There are reasons to criticize this from a Vajrayāna point of view, but not from a sutrayāna perspective. This is no more nor less than the analytical ultimate shown in Yogacara too, i.e., both ultimates are analytical and can be weighed on their merits in terms of argument. But the Buddhist path is not one of making dogmatic assertions about the ultimate. That is for other schools.

Further, Nāgārjuna clearly states:

Dependent on the relative, the ultimate is understood;
realizing the ultimate, nirvana is attained.

So we are to realize the non-categorized ultimate on the basis of our analysis of things -- not by mystical dogmatic assertions about transcendent nondual awarenesses.

Vidyaraja said:

The reason Buddha refrained from making assertions was to avoid metaphysical speculation or getting trapped in concepts about the ultimate rather than waking up and directly knowing it with our Dharma-eye.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha made all kinds of metaphysical assertions apart from the fourteen famous positions he considered incorrect questions.

Vidyaraja said:

Buddha also never made the statement, "There is no self, nothing beyond the skandhas" but he did use anatta consistently as an adjective.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddha? The Buddha in Nikayas, Buddha in Prajñāpāramita, etc? You can't just go and cherry pick citations from this canon, that canon, and then assemble your ideal Buddha that corresponds to your biases. You need to carefully study everything. Buddha clearly states in the following passage there is no inherently existing self, while

clarifying that we can agree to a conventional self:

"Ananda, if I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is a self — were to answer that there is a self, that would be conforming with those brahmins & contemplatives who are exponents of eternalism [the view that there is an eternal, unchanging soul]. If I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is no self — were to answer that there is no self, that would be conforming with those brahmins & contemplatives who are exponents of annihilationism [the view that death is the annihilation of consciousness]. If I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is a self — were to answer that there is a self, would that be in keeping with the arising of knowledge that all phenomena are not-self?"

"No, lord."

"And if I — being asked by Vacchagotta the wanderer if there is no self — were to answer that there is no self, the bewildered Vacchagotta would become even more bewildered: 'Does the self I used to have now not exist?'"

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn44/sn44.010.than.html>

Vidyaraja said:

Why go through all the trouble saying what specifically is anatta rather than just proclaiming anatta as the ultimate to avoid all confusion? Could it be that he took it for granted that those he addressed his sermons to were well aware of the Great Self being part of the Indic spiritual culture from which they all derived?

Malcolm wrote:

No, absolutely not. Even in the tathāgatagarbha literature, the so called "self" that is being described is described in the Uttaratantra (as well as the commentary attributed to Asanga) on the basis of reality that is free from all extremes, that is to say the profound emptiness taught in Mahāyāna.

If you propose that there is some other self outside the all, Buddha would reply:

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."

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn35/sn35.023.than.html>

There is clearly no intention by the Buddha to teach some transcendent ultimate non-dual awareness in the Nikayas/Agamas. People who assert the opposite are simply dreaming.

So that's it, that's all there is.

In case you are worried that all those fabulous buddhaqualities would not be possible if emptiness is the real nature of everything, Nāgārjuna quips:

"For one whom emptiness is possible, for that one everything is possible;

for one whom emptiness is not possible, for that one everything is impossible."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

I used attainment as a figure of speech, obviously one cannot attain what one already is and there is not, as you say, a person to know it, but I'd contend that the Supreme Seer "is" it and knows itself as it really is, which is not the aggregates, but rather transcendent pristine nondual Awareness. In any case, what happens when the impermanent aggregates dissolve or reenter the flux of becoming according to your view? If they cease to be in a state of becoming due to the removal of afflictions which cause rebirth, what is left?

Malcolm wrote:

No such supreme seer is discussed in the sūtras. Buddhas, possessors of non-abiding nirvana, are held to possess two kinds of omniscience. But this omniscience is held to arise from a cause. As Kamalashila points out, omniscience must have a cause, otherwise it would arise randomly at all times and in every place. Even Dolbupa does not deny the need for conventionally gathering the two accumulations.

Vidyaraja said:

I understand emptiness as applying to the phenomenal world of becoming or samsara. Once we see it as empty and anatta, we are released from it and attain awakening, which is a state free from becoming, impermanence, dukkha, and death. It is eternal, transcendent, blissful, indestructible, permanent, changeless, and Self.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't need to capitalize self.

Vidyaraja said:

Personally I don't understand how the views you and others describe, which have been accused of nihilism in the past and present and which, even if actually not nihilism, at least sounds close enough to it to have those charges brought up against it, could possibly be an attractive view of spirituality, the nature of ourselves, and our liberation. But as they say, 84,000 gates and various skillful means to account for the diversity of human needs and inclinations. I suppose the only way to know thing as they really are is to awaken.

Malcolm wrote:

We have no latent traces of attachment to divinity or any kind of supreme principle. We understand that samsara and nirvana are only possible because of the emptiness of

both. We understand that both are nominal designations. As Nāgārjuna stated:
These two, samsara and nirvana do not exist.
Instead, thorough knowledge of samsara is nirvana.
And as Āryadeva stated, those who argue against emptiness, must argue for each and everything they argue is not empty, whereas Madhyamakas only need prove emptiness but once. So if your non-empty Buddhaqualities are infinite, you are left with the infinite task of proving each and everyone separately. I am sure there must be a hell for that...oh right, I forgot, it is called gzhan stong hell.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:
PorkChop said:
I thought it was the 3rd Noble Truth...

Malcolm wrote:
Cessation is the third truth of āryas.

PorkChop said:
Cessation of Dukkha right?
Dukkha is characterized by that which is "born, become, made, and conditioned" right?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, cessations are unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned.

They exist conventionally as nominal designations, not ultimately as ontological absolutes.

But many people today interpret this passage as if the Buddha was affirming an ontological absolute. They can if they like but I don't think the Buddha had the intention they seem to think he did. In the end it all boils down to opinion.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 1:43 AM
Title: Re: Westerner who really makes it work at Sera
Content:
Unknown said:
My partner began by asking whether calm abiding was necessary for the attainment of bodhichitta, to which I responded it was.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not correct, because if it was, Shakyamuni could not have first aroused bodhicitta in the hell realms.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

PorkChop said:

I thought it was the 3rd Noble Truth...

Malcolm wrote:

Cessation is the third truth of āryas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 24th, 2013 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The eternalist vision of nirvana that nirvana is as an unconditioned state to be realized, like brahman.

Vidyaraja said:

So how do we relate this to what the Buddha said here:

Malcolm wrote:

It's a pep talk, not to be taken literally as ontological commitment, IMO.

The non-eternalist view of nirvana (erroneously considered annihilationist in some quarters) is that nirvana is the permanent cessation of afflictions which lead to rebirth in samsara, leading to cessation of birth in samsara.

What is the difference between attaining the unconditioned state of nirvana and cessation of birth in samsara?

Cessations are not praptis, obtainments.

No one attains an unconditioned state of nirvana. There are no aggregates in nirvana and therefore, no person can be designated upon those aggregates. Nirvana is simply the cessation of the series of aggregates. Mind you, not the immediate cessation of aggregates, but rather the cessation of the afflictions that cause action which lead to rebirth. Another way to put it is that prajñā burns the afflictions. Once the afflictions are burnt, have no more effect, there is also no need for that prajñā so it too ceases.

If we deny the former, what is left or what are we led to in the latter? Who or what has

ceased being born in samsara and what is the resultant state from such a cessation? In what way is it not eternal? If annica is impermanence and related to dukkha, how is the conquest of samsara not eternal or permanent? If it is not eternal or permanent, why bother?

Nirvana is a permanent state of cessation of birth in samsara. It is an extreme. That is why Mahāyāna conceived of the idea of so called non-abiding nirvana (in contrast with the Nikāya "abiding" nirvana), i.e., being in samsara but not of samsara. In general, the nirvana aspired to in Mahāyāna is the non-abiding nirvana.

Basically, if the word emptiness raises the hair on your neck, it is sign that in the past you were a Mahāyāna practitioner. As for me, as soon as I heard the word "emptiness" I knew I was home, and have been a adherent of the Prajñāpāramitā ever since.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: The Meaning of Rebirth

Content:

undefineable said:

then there might be a 'Chance of the Gaps' among more reflective scientists

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma excludes chance as a form of causation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Ngondro

Content:

zimpickens said:

Hi,

I noticed above that deepbluehum posted that the number counting (in ngondro, I'm guessing) started in the 13th C. I'm curious about the history of this number counting and I wasn't sure that people were doing ngondro in the 13 C. so if there are any leads about this I would appreciate hearing about it.

So if deepbluehum or anyone else knows about these topics please let me know.

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Zim:

People did Ngondro, but the overall systematization of Ngondro seems to be a rather nineteenth century phenomena that spread from Kagyu to the other two schools i.e. Nyingma and Sakya. For example, the massive 350 folio commentary on the Lam 'bras preliminaries authored by Zimog Tulku in the nineteenth century was explicitly influenced by Kun bzang bla ma'i zhal lung. Before this text, there was no separate Sakya Ngondro commentary. And the first independent Ngondro text in Sakya was written by Dezhung Rinpoche.

However, there was ngondro from an ancient period of time. For example, the klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma rgyud [which probably dates to the 13th century and is the root tantra for the mkha' 'gro snying thig] has a fully elaborated ngondro from chapters 63-75. For example, the refuge chapter, 67, does not give a number. Chapter 73 specifies doing Vajrasattva for 21 days, for example.

In general, I think the idea of doing 100,000 thousand comes from the idea of reciting mantras 100,000 times in the gsar ma tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: what is a melong?

Content:

Jikan said:

this may or may not be a DC-specific question.

what is a melong, and why would someone want one? by that I mean, what is its function?

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Me long literally means "to arouse fire" suggesting its original use.

In general, the mirror is a symbol of rig pa. In the DC, it is worn for the purpose of Guru Yoga, primarily.

The mirrors sold by SS store are made from five metals, and all contain a bit of the original mirror given to ChNN by his guru. For DC people, other mirrors are fine, but in general it is better to use one made by Giorgio since they are made according to Rinpoche's precise specifications.

Other melongs you may see are one's crafted for long life mirrors, which function to summon all the essence of the elements reflected in that mirror. Other mirrors are worn as good luck charms. These mirrors typically are stamped with the srid pa'i ho mandala on the back and worn on one's belt. These are usually made of bell metal.

Prisms are also called "me longs."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: The Meaning of Rebirth

Content:

Seishin said:

Not only that, but it is woven into the fabric of Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, the entire point of practicing Buddhadharma, like practicing Samkhya, Yoga, Vedanta, Jainism, Bon and so on is to put an end to rebirth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: The Meaning of Rebirth

Content:

jeeprs said:

So I think understanding 'freedom from rebirth' is not actually a matter of whether you believe in reincarnation. It has a deeper meaning than that. It is about whether you are of this world, part of the whole cycle of birth-and-death, change-and-decay, rising-and-falling, that everything in nature is subject to. Nowadays we seem to think that 'natural' is good and wholesome, yet it is the case that everything in nature is subject to decay and death, even if it is temporarily beautiful, young and vital. Whatever is young becomes old, whatever is born will one day die. That is an inevitable fact for every born being.

So is there is something that is beyond change and decay, that is not subject to the constant cycle of birth and death, something that is always new, never perishing? I think that is what the Buddha found and points to. Living in the light of that, realizing what that is and making oneself available to it, is the meaning of 'liberation from the cycle of birth and death'. And I think that is the real 'meaning of rebirth' - not the exotic idea of 'I will be reborn for many lifetimes'.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a soft theory of rebirth. But it is not what was intended by the Buddha by the term punarbhāva, rebecoming. It is pretty clear [except to some confused westerners] that Buddha advocated a hard theory of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Self hatred

Content:

Konchog1 said:

It's part of my refuge name, Konchog Namdag (rare and precious Triple Gem)

Malcolm wrote:

mchog means supreme. Look it up in any dictionary. Your name means Totally Pure Supreme Gem, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

We have less freedom now than what our grandparents enjoyed.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are being a bit romantic. I am old enough to be your father, and have a pretty good recollection about how "free" speech was in the sixties and seventies. It was not very free. The thing is, that technology was not very advanced, it was a lot harder to track people and collect data on them. So it was easier to go under the radar. But then as now, there were the same pressures against freedom of expression. And in the generation before I was born there were the Red scares, Joe McCarthy and his gang, and so on in this country. Canada has always had more strict censorship policies than the US, following the lead of England.

Indrajala said:

Real political freedoms and freedom of speech are actively curtailed, meanwhile people are led to believe "progressive hiring policies", open-door immigration, acceptance of gay marriage and gender equality are what really count as indicators of freedom and rights.

Malcolm wrote:

Affirmative action was an important step in the US (and I guess in Canada) for moving minorities into the middle class out of step and fetch jobs. We don't have an open door immigration policy, so we don't have that issue. Gay Marriage and Gender equality are simply civil rights issues, that's all. Once the Civil Rights movement in the 1960's was more or less successful in eliminating Jim Crow laws and so on, all similar laws discriminating against people on the basis of religion, gender or gender preference were bound to fail, as they should fail.

Indrajala said:

Canada, like much of the rest of the west, is suffering a great deal of internal stress given increasing energy costs in the face of decadent levels of energy consumption. The natural reaction is to invest resources in increased policing and legitimization (like "we are the custodians of human rights").

Malcolm wrote:

I have been in a lot of places where laws were weak and persons were powerful. These places, like India, China, Mexico, and so on are more perilous places to live than the US and Canada.

I don't know about other people's experience but in the town where I live (in New England) there is so little crime that we really do not have a police force in any real sense.

I am sure than the experience of black communities in LA is quite different than mine, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Malcolm, earlier you spoke about an "eternalist vision of nirvana" (Wed Sep 18, 2013 6:31 am). I am just wondering what an eternalist vision of nirvana is, exactly. Would it be outside of the realm of existence and non-existence?

Malcolm wrote:

The eternalist vision of nirvana that nirvana is as an unconditioned state to be realized, like brahman.

The non-eternalist view of nirvana (erroneously considered annihilationist in some quarters) is that nirvana is the permanent cessation of afflictions which lead to rebirth in samsara, leading to cessation of birth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Jetsun Taranatha

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Recently read that not only was Taranatha one of the closest disciples of the 9th Karmapa, Wangchuk Dorje, but that he also wrote about the histories of several tantras. I know some of what he penned about the Tara tantras wound up in Martin Willson's In Praise of Tara: Songs to the Saviouress, but does anyone know where his history of the

Yamantaka tantras can be found?

For that matter, does anyone know what lineage(s) of Yamantaka were held by Jetsun Taranatha, and which are in Jonang? He practiced Kamtsang, Shangpa, and Jonang, so I'm all ears.

Malcolm wrote:

As a Jonangpa, he probably practiced Varjabhairava on the Rwa Lotsawa tradition, generally avoided by Kagyus because Rwa Lotsawa claimed he had ritually murdered Marpa's son.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Self hatred

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

it actually means "rare and precious"

Malcolm wrote:

Actually it means "supremely rare"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, 'basis' here means 'basis of an individual'?

Malcolm wrote:

Both.

dzogchungpa said:

What is the other one?

Malcolm wrote:

There are two bases, the original general basis and the basis of the person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, 'basis' here means 'basis of an individual'?

Malcolm wrote:

Both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

"Not an atom in the universe vibrates that isn't powered by love."

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the aspect of the basis called compassion is the energy of the display of the universe and all its beings.

smcj said:

Wow. I thought that one wasn't going to find acceptance. He didn't say it to me, so I can't say this is an exact quote, but he continued, something along the lines of,

"Even hate is love; derailed by fear and ignorance, and then perverted by self-cherishing, but it is still love in its genesis."

I always assumed that was more of a Vajrayana-esque "pure view" perspective rather than a Dzogchen perspective, but he did practice Dzogchen too. Pearls before swine, I have not a clue.

Malcolm wrote:

Real "pure" view means seeing universe and beings arising as the basis. The "pure" view in Vajrayāna is merely a conceptual construction which itself needs to be remedied with the completion stage. Dzogchen skips the two stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 23rd, 2013 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

"Not an atom in the universe vibrates that isn't powered by love."

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the aspect of the basis called compassion is the energy of the display of the

universe and all its beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Karma Chagme & Neydo Kagyu

Content:

philji said:

I believe the Dentok Chikma , Machig guru yoga/Chod, originated with Karma Chagme

Malcolm wrote:

No, he just wrote a version based on earlier texts. Dentok Chigma is a term, not a title.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think these have been translated.

Son of Buddha said:

To Malcolm

could you link me to english translations of these Sutras if they even exist(your the only person I know who might be able to find one of these Translations)

Thank you for your time sorry to be now

Arya-dharanish-vararaja Sutra [also known as the Tathagata-maha-karuna-nidesha Sutra]

Anguli-malya Sutra

Jnana-loka-lamkara Sutra

Anuna-trapur-natva-nirdesha-parivarta Sutra

Mahab-jeri Sutra

Avi-kalpa-prave-sha-dharani Sutra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

cloudburst said:

In clear words, Chandrakirti speaks of the difference in the views of ucchedavadins and Madhyamikas:

Clear Words said:

Qualm: Even so, their views are similar in one way, because nihilists consider the absence of an essence in things to be non-existence.

Reply: This is not so. They are not similar because Madhyamikas assert that things without essence exist conventionally; these nihilists do not assert them at all.

cloudburst said:

You may reflect on how this quotation also neatly puts paid to your assertions that 1) madhyamikas do not make assertions, and 2) the Gelug view is that ultimate truth is a non-existent, as Je Tsongkhapa follows Chandrakirti precisely on this point and Chandrakirti here rejects that explicit assertion.

Malcolm wrote:

The rendering you are using is a somewhat inaccurate gloss.

The text says:

saṃvṛtyā mādhyamikairastitvenābhyupagamānna tulyatā

དབུ་མ་པ་དག་གིས་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་པར་ཁས་སྐྱེལ་བའི་བྱུང་

"Because Mādhyamikas agree to existence in the relative..."

The text does not say they "assert" ['dod pa], or established [sgrub pa], etc. It says ābhyupagamā, which means assent, agree, etc.

The Tibetan recension contains an extra passage: དེ་དག་གིས་ཁས་སྐྱེལ་བའི་བྱུང་མི་མཚུངས་པ་ནི་དེ་དོ།

"and because they [atheists] do not agree [to existence in the relative], [mādhyamikas and atheists] are not the same.

However, this passage is a clarification about what exists relatively, not ultimately. The set up for your citation is:

Here, someone contends "Mādhyamikas are no different than atheists [nāstikas, literally "deniers"]. For what reason? They claim virtuous and non-virtuous actions, agents, results and all worlds are empty of inherent existence., and also atheists also claim those things do not exist. Therefore, mādhyamikas are no different than atheists."

That is not so. Mādhyamikas are proponents of dependent origination. Because of production in connection with conditions this world and all other worlds beyond are proposed to be empty of inherent existence because they are produced in connection with conditions. Other worlds and so on are not conceived as non-existent through emptiness of inherent existence because of production in connection with conditions.

Now then, if it is asked why, they [atheists] reject other things similar to the things

perceived in this world based upon the inherent perception of things of this world, having not perceived coming into this world from another world and going into another world from this world. [a complex way of saying atheists only believe what they can see]

If it is said, "In that case, because they conceive the absence of existence in the intrinsic nature of things as non-existence there is a similarity through this view." It is not so. Because Mādhyamikas agree to existence in the relative and because they [atheists] do not agree [to existence in the relative], [mādhyamikas and atheists] are not the same. The context of the language goes back to the idea that those who deny the Vedas are "nastikas", deniers or atheists [better word than nihilist, in my opinion]. Buddhists are considered nastikas by Hindus. Here Candra is rejecting the claim by pointing out cleverly that since Madhyamikas agree to [rather than assert or establish] such thing as karma, agents, results, this world, future worlds, etc., relatively speaking, even though they do not agree to essences, they agree to the moral structure of Indian religious discourse which in general is based on the idea of future lives, karma, etc.

But I don't think we can consider these so called atheists necessarily Carvakas or Lokayatis, etc., people who for example assert existence by virtue of svābhava. The classic example representing the Carvaka view is that things exist through their nature just like the colors in a peacocks feather. No one created it, it just happens that way. Unfortunately, we do not have any actual Carvaka texts, just parodies of their views here and there in Buddhist and Hindu texts and plays. These so called atheists may very well be just those who do not subscribe to a siddhanta, whether buddhist nor non-buddhist.

Finally, this passage does not defend your assertion that Tsongkhapa does not himself assert the ultimate is a non-existence, since we have already seen that you admit he does assert a non-existence as ultimate i.e. the non-existence of inherent existence in the ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

Since that which perceives or misperceives the basis is mind, you do not skip any intermediate step, and you end up as "substance dualistic," or not, as everyone else.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not exactly. But if you are interested in Dzogchen teachings [which I doubt], basically the point being underscored is that matter and intelligence are non-dual. For example, it is a special tenet of Dzogchen that even the formless realms are material, i.e., that basically, wherever there is matter, there is consciousness, wherever there is consciousness, there is matter. You can either say that matter is intrinsically conscious or that consciousness is intrinsically embodied. Either way it amounts to the same thing. "Sentient" and "non-sentient" are merely conventional designations based on appearances generated by ignorance.

cloudburst said:

And this light? What is that, precisely, photons? The truth of it is that you will engage in verbal gymnastics to avoid the use of the term "mind," but you can never stick the landing.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not photons, not physical light in the western scientific sense of the term. Precisely, the basis is *ye shes*. Empty luminous energetic *ye shes* which appears to a neutral awareness (which itself rises out of the basis when a *vāyu* in the basis stirs).

cloudburst said:

Mind and it's objects are the same nature, or substance.
Which substance is that?

Malcolm wrote:

They are the nature of empty appearances to awareness.

This certainly only means dependently originated appearances of material and immaterial objects.

Just wondering, since Sautrantikas like Vasubandhu clearly explain that mind and matter are different substances.

Sautrantikas say alot of things. There is a time and a place for that to be very helpful to some.

[/quote]

Generally, we understand that Gelugpas follow Sautrantika presentations of conventional truth. You know, that course outer madhyamaka that the gzhan stong pas keep yammering on about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

cloudburst said:

such as the existence of other worlds.

Malcolm wrote:

This just means a next life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Vāyu means movement, and that is about it.

dzogchungpa said:

So how are the other elements defined in this context?

Malcolm wrote:

Read Germano's Tshig don mdzod

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

cloudburst said:

why do you say that, please?

Malcolm wrote:

Because they are advocates of "cutting off". You are conflating the ucchedavāda view with the Carvaka and Lokayati schools. They are not really the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that in Dzogchen teachings mind and matter are not treated as different substances as they are in other Buddhist systems. They are equally treated as produces of the five elements. The way in which Dzogchen avoids the charge of being "physicalist" is that the five elements themselves arise from misperception of the nature of the basis [more or less emptiness endowed with light], without needing the intermediate step of proposing everything is an appearance of mind and so on. And of course the awareness that misperceives the basis arises out of a vāyu that stirs in the basis, and so on. It gets a little complex.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, this is where I get confused. What do you mean by the five elements then? Isn't vāyu one of them? It seems circular. Also, I don't mind if it gets complex, I would really like to hear the complete explanation.

Malcolm wrote:

Vāyu means movement, and that is about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

Simply dogmatically asserting your point will not convince anyone but your disciples.

Malcolm wrote:

You just admitted it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

but your claim that dzogchen explains that mind is the operation of vayu in the body is a equally a form of physicalism.

Malcolm wrote:

One, it is it not a claim, it is textual fact.

Second, it would be if that were all there was to it.

The point is that in Dzogchen teachings mind and matter are not treated as different substances as they are in other Buddhist systems. They are equally treated as produces of the five elements. The way in which Dzogchen avoids the charge of being "physicalist" is that the five elements themselves arise from misperception of the nature of the basis [more or less emptiness endowed with light], without needing the intermediate step of proposing everything is an appearance of mind and so on. And of course the awareness that misperceives the basis arises out of a vāyu that stirs in the basis, and so on. It gets a little complex.

cloudburst said:

Mind and it's objects are the same nature, or substance.

Malcolm wrote:

Which substance is that? Just wondering, since Sautrantikas like Vasubandhu clearly explain that mind and matter are different substances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Should Buddhists give money to Hare Krishnas?

Content:

Konchog1 said:

If the money promotes Hindu practices, then it breaks your refuge vows.

Malcolm wrote:

This is merely your opinion.

Your opinion is not supportable by scripture, it is not supportable by reason.

Ashoka, according to you, broke his vows of refuge by impartially donating money to Buddhist Sangha as well as non-Buddhist ascetics. Even the Buddha broke his vows of refuge, according to you, because he encouraged the Vajjians, the subjects of King Pasenadi, to continue to make offerings to and support non-Buddhist ascetics when they visited for offerings.

When people worry about Buddhists following the world wide trend of fundamentalism, such anti-liberal attitudes as this one you display is as far as they need to look to have their fears confirmed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

[

Your information on Gelugpa is off, unfortunately. Gelugpa do not assert the ultimate to be a non-existent. Not at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure they do-- Tsongkhapa asserts the non-existence of inherent existence is the ultimate. Now you might argue that non-existence exists, as I am sure you will; but nevertheless, the Gelug view is that ultimate truth is a non-existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

cloudburst said:

This is only one aspect of the Ucchedavada view. They also believe many things to be

non-existent, such as past and future lives, that they never conceived of as existent, as per Clear Words.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the primary sense of the term.

[/quote]

Nagarjuna only demolishes being in an ultimate sense, he and his disciples continuously assert being, or existence, on the conventional level, albeit as mere imputation as you eloquently established elsewhere in this thread.[/quote]

Well, they don't assert it, they accept it for the purposes of common discourse about appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: mala care

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

geishhin well where do you keep it if not in a bag when not on use. i dont like holding it on my hand or wrist all the time.

Malcolm wrote:

Usually coiled on my practice texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: mala care

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

how do you wash your mala, and do you wash your mala?

Malcolm wrote:

Some people like to wash a new mala in pure water scented with pure sandalwood oil. This is actually a traditional procedure. I never bothered much with this personally. It might be nice to have a new mala blessed by some Lama, but the best blessing is your own mantra recitation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

What I mean is this: Malcolm said earlier in this thread that incorrect views are not really dispelled through reasoning, but through realization, and I agree with that. I also have a lot of faith in the realization of Dudjom R and Dilgo K. If the orthodox Nyingma position, or at least the position of masters like Rongzom and Longchenpa, is not shentong, then they (DR and DKR) must have had good reason to go against that, I would think. So, there seems to be some issue here. Let me also say that I don't know enough about this stuff to have a position one way or the other, although intuitively based on what little I do know, I doubt that I would be a shentongpa.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have written elsewhere; gzhan stong principally arises from the hermeneutical urge to reconcile the treatises of Maitreya and Nāgārjuna with one another. Because Tibetan scholars typically assume that Maitreyanatha is identical to the future Bodhisattva Maitreya, they often feel they cannot privilege Nāgārjuna's views over those of Maitreya.

My feeling about Maitreyanatha is rather different. I feel he was just a normal human person, who lived at a time when there were three major trends of Mahāyāna sutras, i.e., prajñāpāramita, yogacara, and tathāgagarbha. He wrote five treatises: Sūtrālaṃkāra which presents a systematic account of Mahāyāna synthesizing all three trends primarily from a Yogacara perspective

Abhisamayālaṃkāra which presents the implicit paths and stages concealed within the prajñāpāramita sutras

Uttaratantra which synthesizes the thought of the ten tathāgatarbha sūtras

Madhyantavibhaga and the Dharmadharmatāvibhaga which analyzes specific issues in Yogacara thought.

I do not feel that it is necessary to try and reconcile these various trends. What is important is to understand the ideas presented in these three trends and then observe how they are used by later schools and scholars.

For example, the way tathāgatarbha is used in Secret Mantra and Dzogchen is quite different than the way it is presented in the Uttaratantra. The way Dolbupa uses the three nature theory is very different than the way it is used in the Yogacara of Maitreya and Asanga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Based upon what Malcolm wrote, that emptiness is svabhava, which I assume is saying all entities lack svabhava which means entities are empty, does this create a split between those Buddhist traditions that don't see any svabhava at all, and those that follow tathagatarbha and all beings have the Buddha-nature? Right now I am getting the message that one tradition says that you have no essence, you are nothing, while

the other says you have a Buddha nature. It sounds like one is nihilistic and the other is not.

Malcolm wrote:

What you say does not make any sense. Even those traditions that accept tathāgatagarbha as something like a self still maintain that entities such as matter, etc., and so on are empty of svābhāva. Their argument is that sentient beings have an essence, in other words that minds or consciousness has an essence. They are not arguing, actually, that all things have an essence.

Therefore, if you are going to attach to the label "nihilist" to those traditions that assert the absence of essence in insentient things, you would have to label all Mahāyāna traditions "nihilist", including the tathāgatagarbha schools.

If this is how you feel, you are better off following one of the non-Mahāyāna schools that assert that things exist by virtue of intrinsic characteristics.

Koji said:

I have no feelings in this matter. Nagarjuna is just confusing at times. Would you say that Nagarjuna's position that all entities are empty of svābhāva just a restatement of all entities or things are not the self (sabbe dhammā anattā, Dh 279)?

Malcolm wrote:

I would say his position is that there is no self which is the part of the aggregates or separate from them; and then when Buddha spoke self and not-self, there is a context that needs to be considered for each statement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 22nd, 2013 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that just means that the current Karma Kagyu orthodoxy is slightly eternalistic

dzogchungpa said:

It seems like the current Nyingma orthodoxy is too. Why do all these great masters succumb to the eternalist temptation?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know why people keep on insisting this -- it isn't true. The orthodox Nyingma view represented by Rongzom, Longchenpa, and more lately Mipham and Khenpo Zhenga.

While it is true that Dilgo Khyentse and Dudjom Rinpoche followed the gzhan stong school in terms of sutrayāna, there are many masters such as Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, and so on who do not follow the gzhan stong school.

The primary reason why we think that Nyingma = gzhan stong is because the influence of Trungpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

All I know is that in contemporary times Khenpo Tsultrim is the definitive voice on this subject for the Karma Kagyu sect. That means the quote I gave is safely said to be current Karma Kagyu orthodoxy.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that just means that the current Karma Kagyu orthodoxy is slightly eternalistic, just as the current Gelugpa orthodoxy is slightly nihilistic, since the former assert the ultimate be an existent while the latter assert the ultimate to be a non-existent.

As for me, I will just stick with the great madhyamaka enunciated by Kawa Paltseg:
Freedom of two extremes in the ultimate
is asserted as the great madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Based upon what Malcolm wrote, that emptiness is svabhava, which I assume is saying all entities lack svabhava which means entities are empty, does this create a split between those Buddhist traditions that don't see any svabhava at all, and those that follow tathagatagarbha and all beings have the Buddha-nature? Right now I am getting the message that one tradition says that you have no essence, you are nothing, while the other says you have a Buddha nature. It sounds like one is nihilistic and the other is not.

Malcolm wrote:

What you say does not make any sense. Even those traditions that accept tathāgatagarbha as something like a self still maintain that entities such as matter, etc., and so on are empty of svābhāva. Their argument is that sentient beings have an essence, in other words that minds or consciousness has an essence. They are not arguing, actually, that all things have an essence.

Therefore, if you are going to attach to the label "nihilist" to those traditions that assert the absence of essence in insentient things, you would have to label all Mahāyāna traditions "nihilist", including the tathāgatagarbha schools.

If this is how you feel, you are better off following one of the non-Mahāyāna schools that assert that things exist by virtue of intrinsic characteristics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

The odd thing is that Asanga was not fond of the tathāgatagarbha school.

Huh? That's kinda like saying Thomas Jefferson wasn't for independence from England!

Malcolm wrote:

You would think that if tathāgatagarbha were important to Asanga it would be mentioned in the Yogacarabhūmi, but the word *de bzhin gshegs pa'i snying po*, tathāgatagarbha, does not appear even once in the entire collection, and this is his Magnum Opus.

Now, it is true that there is a commentary on the Uttaratantra attributed to Asanga, and some scholars believe it is authored by him as well; but if so, this merely reinforces my elsewhere mentioned thesis that the Yogacara school and the Tathāgatagarbha were regarded as separate streams in Indian Mahāyāna and not mixed up with each other.

Of course, this statement in the Āryalaṅkāvatāra-nāma-mahāyānasūtravṛttitathāgatahṛdayālaṅkāra is very nice:

"The dharmatā of the mind liberated from the four extremes constitutes the sugatagarbha."

Here is another nice definition by Mūnīcandra in Sūtrālaṅkāravṛttibhāṣya:

"As such, since suchness exists in sentient beings, because of that, all sentient beings are tathāgatagarbhins."

This means that sentient beings enclose or hold (garbhin) the garbha of the tathāgatas, i.e., suchness.

Of course the Tarkajvala by Bhavya maintains:

The statement "The tathāgata pervades" means wisdom pervades all objects of knowledge, but it does not mean abiding in everything like Viśnu. Further,

"Tathāgatagarbhin" means emptiness, signlessness and absence of aspiration exist the continuums of all sentient beings, but is not an inner personal agent pervading everyone".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Finding One's Yidam

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

A weird realization I just had is that there are a handful of peaceful deities in Kriya tantra that call out to me, but as far as [semi-]wrathful deities go, only 2 are of any interest in HYT. And there's nothing in between. Curious...

heart said:

The same deity often exist in various levels of Tantras so I might be a mistake to assign a deity to a certain level of Tantra, this is specially true in the Nyingma.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is especially true universally in all four schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Finding One's Yidam

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

That said, all yidams are ultimately of the same nature and have completely realized the union of wisdom & compassion, so perhaps I'm fixating on something arbitrary due my mind wanting me to fit in a nice little slot that doesn't exist. From my academic work in Religion, including Vajrayana, I know deep down that there aren't really any solid categories and it's all more complex & fluid.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Yidams such as Jambhala and so on, other action deities (acton the sense of karma, not kriya) will not produce supreme siddhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Finding One's Yidam

Content:

Luke said:

Sometimes the deity which is chosen for you at random is one you have a special connection with (according to Tibetan beliefs, at least).

Malcolm wrote:

This is a myth. I have been in Tibetan Buddhism for many, many years. Not once has any teacher ever picked out a yidam for me to practice. Yes, it does happen sometimes, but it is not common.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

So, is there anything which is ultimately real, which does possess 'own-being'?

My favorite thing to quote is from Khenpo Tsultrim's "Progressive Stages of Meditation on Emptiness". In the chapter on Shentong he writes:

"This non-conceptual Wisdom Mind is not the object of the conceptualizing process and so is not negated by Madhyamaka reasoning. Therefore, it can be said to be the only thing that has absolute and true existence."

He goes on to explain that the non-conceptual Wisdom Mind is not self-empty like Nagarjuna's 4 points or the Prajnaparamita Sutras describe. They are "empty-of-other", that is empty of anything other than its own pure essence that is replete with the qualities of Buddhahood.

(btw Malcolm does not subscribe to this idea.)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and this is why gzhan stong does not really go beyond the false aspectarian yogacara of Ratnakaraśanti. The main difference between the two is that the former avoids the error of the latter, who assert that the non-existence of the imagined nature in the dependent nature is the perfected nature, thus setting up an internal contradiction that the dependent nature becomes unconditioned. Charitably, we can say that gzhan stong is an intermediate view between Yogacara and Madhyamaka.

The main error of the gzhan stong pas however, as I have written elsewhere, is the attempt to map the two truths onto the three natures, where they consider the perfected nature the ultimate and the imagined and the dependent natures relative. In doing, so, they basically do violence to the Yogacara school's own formulation of these three natures. The reason they do this is that there has been a compelling exegetical need of Tibetan scholars to rectify the treatises of Maitreya as a whole with the six texts of reasoning by Nāgārjuna. In the end, both systems lose since neither is accurately represented. Basically, gzhan stong represents an attempt to reconcile all the main lines of Indian Mahāyāna thought as I have noted elsewhere.

Further, by mixing the tathātagarbha doctrine into the mix, they also ruin that. The odd thing is is that Asanga was not fond of the tathātagarbha school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, when we say something is dravyasat (Tib. rdzas yod), we mean it "substantially exists".

dzogchungpa said:

What are the other kinds of sat or yod?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventional existence, ultimate existence, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

jeeprs said:

But I don't think that can be then taken to mean that 'nothing is real', which is the error of nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:

The error of ucchedavada is that things which exist then perish, i.e., become non-existent. But Nāgārjuna tradition also demolishes being as well. Since neither being nor nonbeing are tenable, well, you don't have much left over to describe as real, or unreal, for that matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: A Note on "Substance"

Content:

jeeprs said:

Buddhism denies that there is any real essence or substance in individual things.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends entirely on which school of Buddhism you are talking about. The word we are using in Buddhism to describe something as a substance is dravya. For example, when we say something is dravyasat (Tib. rdzas yod), we mean it "substantially exists".

Many people act as if Madhyamaka and Madhyamaka influenced scholars present the truth (tm) in Buddhism. But it is not true. Madhyamakas continued to be criticized by

both other Mahāyānists as well as by Nikāya schools until Buddhadharma perished in India.

It is primarily because Vajrayāna Buddhism enshrined Madhyamaka as the supreme tenet of sūtra that today we observe Madhyamaka is the something like the King of Buddhist philosophy to which everyone must pay homage, even scholars like Dolbupa.

That being said, I am myself, of course, of the conviction that Nāgārjuna got it right. Frankly, to borrow a phrase from Whithead, "The safest general characterization of the Buddhist philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Nāgārjuna."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Substance dualism as far as I know is usually a Christian platonic term..that asserts that mind is a fundamentally different substance from matter.

I'm interested also to hear about the nuances of it from Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Substance dualism is a description of Descartes viewpoint. It holds that mind is non-physical substance. So does Buddhism in general. For example, Vasubandhu defines mind as a dravya, which in general can be understood as "substance". In general, in Buddhism nama and rūpa are held to be different in kind and substance though mutually conditioning.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Got it, how does Dzogchen differ here? Beyond the obvious I mean... i have an inkling but i'm not sure.

Malcolm wrote:

While there are of course Dzogchen texts that describe mind and body as separate, in general, the innermost secret cycle holds that the perception that there is a difference between the animate and inanimate is a mistaken one. In the state of ultimate liberation, the distinction between animate and inanimate disappears because it is not true. Further, like other Vajrayāna traditions, Dzogchen provides a physical account for the process of rebirth. For example in the Vajramala Tantra it is proposed that the alayavijñāna inseparable with the mahāprāṇavāyu is responsible for transmigration, for the appropriation of a new series of aggregates. But Dzogchen goes a step further and explicitly identifies consciousness as the operation of a vāyu in the body. Vāyus of course are the function of the refined element of air inside the human body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

But what definition of emptiness are you using? I am only aware of the definition found in the nikayas and agamas.

Malcolm wrote:

The definition found in Mahāyāna i.e. emptiness means empty of svābhava.

For example, in the Āryākṣayamatīrdeśatikā:

"The descriptions from the element of self (atmadhātu) up to the element of all phenomena (sarvadharmadhātu) are the nature of one taste in the ultimate dharmadhātu, emptiness. Since individual characteristics do not exist, all phenomena said to be "equivalent" since they are undifferentiated."

Koji said:

Sorry for asking another question. Is nirvana also empty of svābhava?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, since it is a dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Substance dualism as far as I know is usually a Christian platonic term..that asserts that mind is a fundamentally different substance from matter.

I'm interested also to hear about the nuances of it from Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Substance dualism is a description of Descartes viewpoint. It holds that mind is non-physical substance. So does Buddhism in general. For example, Vasubandhu defines mind as a dravya, which in general can be understood as "substance". In general, in Buddhism nama and rūpa are held to be different in kind and substance though mutually conditioning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

And you think our present systems in the west are reflective of people investing their leadership with power? No, positions of major power are acquired by the merchant class through money. If they don't directly hold the seat of office, they are still the power behind the scenes calling the shots.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on which leaders you mean? When it comes to major posts like "president" and the senate, yes, this is clearly a money game. In the US, the House is not so much a money game -- this is why we have such a diversity of wingnuts in the house. People actually do manage to vote people in who they feel represent their interests.

Even when the business class is "calling the shots", they will do so only so long as a) they are tolerated or b) are willing to resort to repressive measures. History shows that b) never works out in the end of for the oppressors. Oppression is a short term game with high costs for the players. So even the so-called "shot callers" are only able to call shots based in whether they are allowed to.

Indrajala said:

This is why Polybius praised the Roman model: it incorporated elements of monarchy, oligarchy and democracy.

Malcolm wrote:

As does the US system -- maybe this is why it is such a strong form of government. We have the Executive branch i.e. monarchy with a smattering of oligarchy; the judicial branch, clearly an oligarchy; and the house and the senate, democratic, with the latter tending towards oligarchic stasis. Sounds like your ideal place.

Indrajala said:

And in our present model the descendents of exploitative capitalists are increasingly corrupt and running "democratic" governments from Wall Street and other financial centers.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not increasingly corrupt, they are just as corrupt as they ever where and are ever going to get. They are just corrupt.

Indrajala said:

That's probably more to do with the wealth accumulation. Middle class people with an education are less likely to resort to petty crime. They got too much to lose (like property, a career and family).

Malcolm wrote:

It has a lot to do with the fact that it is a lot harder to get away with crime than it used to be in the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

really, honestly and sincerely not true.

Malcolm wrote:

The manner in which the other schools resolved this is through recourse to a species of mentalism i.e. the subtle inner madhyamaka, if you will.

cloudburst said:

This is a definitional move, and a weak argument in my book.

Malcolm wrote:

No, seriously -- for example, Khyentse Wangchuk declares that there is no difference between mind and matter because everything is established as mind. This is perfectly acceptable thing to say in a Lamdre context. I have seen the same statement [everything is established as mind] coming from Gelugpas when they explain how one is to practice Vajrayāna, as opposed to how the Gelug sutra view is formed and asserted. This is also how the Kagyus phrase things.

This is not how Dzogchen deals with the issue at all. Please bear in mind that not everything said by Nyingmapas necessarily reflects the view of Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

Giving too many people access to political power is unwise, though such ideas are contrary to contemporary democratic ideals.

Malcolm wrote:

So you have basically become a monarchist, for all intents and purposes. Good luck

with that.

Indrajala said:

I personally would rather have a ruling class that has power by virtue of inherited title

Malcolm wrote:

As if this has ever actually worked at any time in history in any civilization. Āryadeva points out the foolishness of this kind of thinking in 400 Verses. He clearly advises kings that kings (and leaders in general) rule because of the power the people invest in them and not otherwise.

Indrajala said:

It is in the interests of a landed aristocracy to look to the well-being of their populace because their power base depends on them, not business activities. I'd rather have real kings than kingmakers, so to speak.

Malcolm wrote:

Pure romanticism. The landed aristocracy in western England, for example, left their people starving and in rags. In France it was worse. Russia, even worse. There have been very few "enlightened" kings in history capable of ruling with a fair hand and with the benefit of their people as their chief priority. Mostly they are the descendants of plundering mercenaries and invaders, for example, like the Normans. Further, history shows that in general, generations of landed aristocracy become increasingly more corrupt and exploitative. It is just a form of primitive capital accumulation, that's all.

Indrajala said:

In any case, our present models in the west are rapidly unwinding. We have a lot less freedom now than our grandparents did, which should be alarming, but for many it isn't.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but that is a social consequence of technology and economics. We also have a great deal less crime in the West than we did fifty years ago. The reason US prisons are so full is because of our ridiculous and ineffective drug laws.

Indrajala said:

As time goes on democracy will fail, tyranny will solve the problems of the day (probably at the cost of many lives) and then people will probably look back with disgust at the models of society and government we so often cherish today. Such is how political cycles operate in western civilization.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, maybe not. Personally, I don't believe that in our lifetime there will be much change in the world political balance status quo unless it is driven by a major energy crisis, or because of escalating climate instability. Even so, here in the US, I don't foresee much true political instability. Our system is actually fairly distributed and decentralized.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

really, honestly and sincerely not true.

Malcolm wrote:

The manner in which the other schools resolved this is through recourse to a species of mentalism i.e. the subtle inner madhyamaka, if you will.

Anyway, I think you can agree a separate thread is required.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 21st, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

But what definition of emptiness are you using? I am only aware of the definition found in the nikayas and agamas.

Malcolm wrote:

The definition found in Mahāyāna i.e. emptiness means empty of svābhava.

For example, in the Āryākṣayamatīrdeśatikā:

"The descriptions from the element of self (atmadhātu) up to the element of all phenomena (sarvadharmadhātu) are the nature of one taste in the ultimate dharmadhātu, emptiness. Since individual characteristics do not exist, all phenomena said to be "equivalent" since they are undifferentiated."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Direct rebirth as a bug

Content:

lobster said:

It should be regarded as particular to forms of a buddhism that are perpetuated by those without a comprehensive education.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a pretty snotty and arrogant statement, as well as being factually untrue. There

are all kinds of people far more educated than you, fully conversant in the latest on neuroscience, physics, and so forth, who nevertheless continue to adhere to a belief in transmigration or rebirth or reincarnation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

As Plato and Polybius described long ago, democracy naturally leads to the most brutal of dictatorships.

Malcolm wrote:

Winston Churchill quipped "It has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all the others that have been tried."

Indrajala said:

The expansion of competing political groups leads to political deadlock, which means major problems remain unresolved while the commonly accepted standard of living declines. The masses are quick to allow for tyranny if it is in their interests regardless of the ethical implications.

Malcolm wrote:

So what do you suggest, Monarchy?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: "Sung-due" collection of sutras

Content:

Sherlock said:

Can anyone tell me more about this collection of sutras by Tsongkhapa called the "Sung-due". I found some information that might be relevant here:

<http://www.lamayeshe.com/?sect=article&id=310>

I got advice from Lama Dawa regarding this collection.

Malcolm wrote:

The gzung 'dus is a mainly a compendium of dharanis [gzungs]. But I don't think it was

assembled by Tsongkhapa. I could be wrong, but I think it is older than him. Anyway, it contains many extracts of the dharani portions of sutras, small sutras, for healing, repelling obstacles, it has aspiration prayers, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Everyone agrees the absolute is ineffable, therefore all teachings are provisional.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Gelugpas assert it is effable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

Emptiness - the essence of all there is

Regrettably, that is a big no-no in Buddhist philosophy. Emptiness is exactly the absence of essence. In fact the one thing that everything has in common is absence of essence.

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakirti clearly says in the Prasannapāda, essencelessness is the essence of everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

“O Lord, there are two kinds of wisdom of emptiness with reference to the tathāgatagarbha.

The tathāgatagarbha that is empty is separate from, free from, and different from the stores of all defilements.

And the tathāgatagarbha

that is not empty is not separate from, not free from, and not different from the inconceivable Buddha-Dharmas more numerous than the sands of the Ganges River.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the question becomes what buddha-dharmas means in this context.

But all of this is really wide of the mark of the main conversation I was having with Vidyārāja, the essence of which "what constitutes a criteria for calling someone Buddhist or non-Buddhist", spurred by my remark that so called "Early Buddhism" is a pedantic reconstruction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

we can separate the 2 terms but I will just quote further proof to connect them back together.

Malcolm wrote:

it's not necessary. The fact is that the term dharmadhātu has a limited usage in these sutras. The term dharmadhātu is synonymous with emptiness, which is what you asked me to show. I have shown that. Nothing you can cite will show the opposite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

So the modern rejection of the idea of 'eternal round' on the basis that it is not really a part of the original meaning of the teaching, completely changes its context. Without the prospect of being bound to the wheel of samsara for life after life, 'nirvana' then becomes simply a state of being 'stress free' and Buddhism more like a psycho-therapeutic discipline than a sadhana.

Malcolm wrote:

It all really depends on how interested you are in forcing people to follow a "religion".

jeeprs said:

Not in the least. I have no power to coerce anyone nor any interest in doing so. It is simply a matter of respect for the teaching. Secular interpretations may be fine, but they are derivative, not definitive, which is what many people are trying to make them.

Malcolm wrote:

As we have seen throughout this thread, one's persons definitive is another person's provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 7:31 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which emptiness? Which tradition? Whose interpretation?

Vidyaraja said:

How about your interpretation? Who or what is aware of emptiness in your view?

Malcolm wrote:

The non-categorizable emptiness has no characteristics so it cannot be a direct object of a conventional mind. As Shantideva states, "the ultimate is not within the experiential range of the mind".

Obviously, categorizable emptiness can be conceived by a conventional mind since that kind of emptiness is also a convention, designated on the discovery of a non-existence such as this seed is empty of inherent existence because it is a product. Whatever inherently exists cannot be a product.

Conventionally speaking however, a non-conceptual wisdom "apprehends" emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

your search engine is off.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not use a search engine, I performed a manual search of the digital file of the two volume version present in the bka' 'gyur.

Son of Buddha said:

with that said I respectfully disagree.....But at the same time to refute you I would have to literally reread and note every single time the phrase Dharmakaya

Malcolm wrote:

We are not discussing the term dharmakāya, rather we are discussing the term dharmadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

All four traditions of Tibetan Buddhism, when correctly understood, reject substance dualism. The Gelugpas, at least, also present the teachings in such a way as to allow someone prone to substance dualism to benefit from it a provisional stance. I suspect the other traditions do as well. Each tradition is very rich.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is true that because the five schools [we must include Bon] are tantric, they have a better shot at it. But really, honestly, only in Dzogchen teachings is the substance dualism that is a prime feature of Buddhist thought from abhidharma right up the the lower tantras truly overcome in an explicit fashion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

So the modern rejection of the idea of 'eternal round' on the basis that it is not really a part of the original meaning of the teaching, completely changes its context. Without the prospect of being bound to the wheel of samsara for life after life, 'nirvana' then becomes simply a state of being 'stress free' and Buddhism more like a psycho-therapeutic discipline than a sadhana.

Malcolm wrote:

It all really depends on how interested you are in forcing people to follow a "religion".

Frankly, all many people want from meditation and yoga is a lack of stress in this life. Buddha also provided for this kind of person, as it made perfectly clear in the Kalamas sutra. If we classify the kind of teaching that Batchelor and people like him, the so called Secular Buddhists, seem to advocate, they are teaching what is termed by the Buddha as "the vehicles of devas and humans". But that is a Buddhist vehicle, and we have to respect it as such, even if we imagine we want more, something like total liberation.

Again, it boils down to the patches on Buddha's robes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

LastLegend said:

There is a Deathless state. Why wouldn't there? "It" is not going anywhere.

Malcolm wrote:

When you have eradicated all afflictions which cause rebirth, this is all the deathlessness you need. No more birth, BAM! no more death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Why is it too broad? Who or what is aware of emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

Which emptiness? Which tradition? Whose interpretation?

Vidyaraja said:

And what do we make of the following by Padmasambhava:

Malcolm wrote:

He is talking about vidyā. If you understand the context of the Dzogchen tradition from which this is derived, you will understand that non-buddhists are thought to misidentify vidyā and make incorrect imputations upon it.

Otherwise, you will observe that the list is in ascending order, from non-Buddhists to common Dzogchen terms:

vehicles of non-Buddhists = atman

sravakas = anatman

Mahāyāna denominations:

mind

perfection of wisdom

tathāgatagarbha

Vajrayāna

mahamudra

thig le gnyag gcig

dharmadhātu

ālaya
tha mal gyis shes pa

So I guess this means that you are happy to consider tathāgatagarbha equivalent to mind-only, correct?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 5:58 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:

Son of Buddha said:
so this means you don't know first hand how many times Dharma Dhatu is actually mentioned in the Tathagatagarbha Suttas, your information is based upon the search engine you are using and is only as good as the search engine that is being used.....with that said your search results are flawed.

Malcolm wrote:
The Tathāgatagarbha sūtra does not use the word dharmadhātu even once. It simply is not used in that sūtra as it is present in the bka' gyur

Yup, you are correct, in terms of the Nirvana sūtra, the search engine I used was flawed it will not return searches in texts that span two volumes.

So, I checked via other means and In the Tibetan recension of the two volumes of the Nirvana sutra the term "chos kyi dbyings" i.e. dharmadhātu occurs exactly total of sixteen times. It does not suffer this problem for shorter sutras that do not span volumes. Since the other tathāgatagarbha sūtras are quite short, I have no fear that my search was flawed. Here it is, BTW:

<http://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/xml3/xml/>

Here is another interesting quote from the Nirvana sutra:
Son of a good family, all phenomena are false, where they cease, that is called "true", "a true perception", "dharmadhātu", "wisdom of perfection", "ultimate" and "ultimate emptiness".

Son of Buddha said:
this is actually explained in the sutra, you see when the Dharmakaya is obscured by defilements it is referred to as the Tathagatagarbha.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, I know.

Son of Buddha said:

Now Malcolm the Teachings of Emptiness is of the Tathagatagarbha/Dharmakaya is actually taught in the Buddha Nature Sutras in extreme detail.the Emptiness that is taught is "other Emptiness" i.e Shentong

Malcolm wrote:

This is highly debatable.

Son of Buddha said:

it wasn't neglected.....you just couldn't find the info in your search engine.

Malcolm wrote:

It's neglected, since a proper and thorough examination of the term dharmadhātu revealed that it occurs exactly 16 times in the Nirvana sūtra's Tibetan recension. There is no Sanskrit original, so you would have to consult the Chinese in order to cross check this. I listed the other mentions. My point still stands the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha identifies them explicitly. Vipassi, Sikhin, etc.

Vidyaraja said:

So what about the part about the ancient way that leads to Brahma?

Malcolm wrote:

You mean this?

Vidyaraja said:

7 S.IV.117: te brāhmaṇā purāṇaṃ saranti . . . so maggo brahmapattiyā. In Itiv., 28, 29 those who follow this (ancient) Way taught by the Buddhas are called Mahātmās. [Mais, Sn.284–315, maintenant que es Brāhmaṇs ont négligé depuis longtemps leur Loi ancienne, le Bouddha la prêche à nouveau.]

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure you can find someone on Dhammawheel who can explain those passages to you correctly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

genius of Dolpopa's Mountain Doctrine to support my affirmation of the Self in the context of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

If you really want to understand this work, you need to study with Jonangpas, and practice Kalacakra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Also, what is the relationship between emptiness and awareness? Who or what is aware of emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

Your question is too broad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Just because it isn't explicitly expressed doesn't mean it isn't implicit. There is duality between nirvana and samsara, but in my opinion the deathless Nirvana which Buddha speaks of is without differentiation.

Malcolm wrote:

Purusha is also undifferentiated, as well as uncreated, deathless, permanent, etc. Purusha satisfies all your criteria for a self. And if you don't like Samkhya plurality of purushas, you always have the Advaita interpretation of Purusha as one without a second.

Vidyaraja said:

Who were the formerly Awakened Ones he speaks of.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha identifies them explicitly. Vipassi, Sikhin, etc.

Vidyaraja said:

So you are an enlightened Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it just means I am certain about what Buddhadharma means to me, and which parts of it are definitive and which parts are provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, I don't know. In ordinary life I seem to be able to use the word well enough. What do you mean by it?

Malcolm wrote:

Well I have already explained that Dzogchen maintains that everything including buddhahood is completely equivalent with an illusion.

dzogchungpa said:

I know, I'm sorry for being so obtuse. So, the purpose of Dzogchen is to know precisely what? A delusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, I don't know. In ordinary life I seem to be able to use the word well enough. What do you mean by it?

Malcolm wrote:

Well I have already explained that Dzogchen maintains that everything including buddhahood is completely equivalent with an illusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this is why I don't follow this point of view. Dzogchen has exactly the opposite point of view. The purpose of Dzogchen is to know precisely your own state.

dzogchungpa said:
Is that state real?

Malcolm wrote:
What do you mean by real?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:47 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:
cloudburst said:
You're practically a Gelugpa.

Malcolm wrote:
Thanks for the compliment, but I don't think so.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:45 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
M: The body is made of food, as the mind is made of thoughts.
See them as they are. Non-identification, when natural and spontaneous, is liberation. You need not know what you are.
Enough to know what you are not. What you are you will never know, for every discovery reveals new dimensions to conquer.
The unknown has no limits.
Q: Does it imply ignorance for ever?
M: It means that ignorance never was.
Don't get mad.

Malcolm wrote:
Right, this is why I don't follow this point of view. Dzogchen has exactly the opposite point of view. The purpose of Dzogchen is to know precisely your own state.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:43 AM
Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana
Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Samkhya is dualistic, Buddhism is nondual.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Buddhism? Certainly not the Buddhism of the Pali Canon. Bhikkhu Bodhi for example has argued for a hard dualism of nirvana and samsara. Samkhya merely proposes a different account of unconditioned and conditioned. Purusha is the unconditioned, Prakṛiti is the conditioned. Purusha is the self, prakṛiti is the not self.

Basically, all you atmanvadins are doing is merely imposing Samkhya onto Buddhism.

Vidyaraja said:

Just because the Buddha had a unique conceptual system for expressing the inexpressible and leading his followers to the one Truth doesn't mean he denied the Self. Aside from that, ask Ananda Coomaraswamy points out in his book "Hinduism and Buddhism", the Buddha didn't think his way was utterly novel:

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, you will be happier as a devotee of Advaita. You will always be miserable in Buddhadharma because you have to work so hard to find places where you think your views are expressed. But in Advaita, or Trika, it is fully present.

Vidyaraja said:

"I have seen," the Buddha says, "the ancient Way, the Old Road that was taken by the formerly All-Awakened, and that is the path I follow"; and since he elsewhere praises the Brāhmaṇs of old who remembered the Ancient Way that leads to Brahma, there can be no doubt that the Buddha is alluding to "the ancient narrow path that stretches far away, whereby the contemplatives, knowers of Brahma, ascend, set free" (vimuktāḥ), mentioned in verses that were already old when Yajñavalkya cites them in the earliest Upaniṣad.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha used a lot of metaphors with an intellectual history. This does not prove he is a Vedantic sage, or was a proponent of Vedanta. There is absolutely no evidence of this.

Their views are important as part of the history of ideas; however, no serious expert in the field of Buddhist studies really holds their theosophically informed opinions in any regard.

These individuals weren't theosophers, some were Theravadin Sangharajas and some just Pali scholars. Coomaraswamy was a genius who was an expert in religious studies, metaphysics, and I believe could speak some 30 languages. I am sure there are also contemporary experts in Buddhist studies who maintain the view of the Great Self, like Susan K. Hookam of Oxford University for example.

The four westerners (Coomaraswamy was western educated) you mentioned are all deeply influenced by Theosophy. Coomaraswamy may have been a genius, but his

understanding of Buddhism is sorely deficient as far as I am concerned.

I doubt Shenphen Hookham as the same idea about this that you do. gzhan stong is complicated, has many schools, and Kongtrul's (about which she wrote) is basically a modified version of Sakya Chogden's gzhan stong, which is markedly different than Dolbupa's version.

You are a perennialist. This is fine, but you do realize that your views are a severely minority opinion in Buddhadharma.

Seems to prop up more frequently the more I read of older Buddhist masters. For example, I've been reading on Korean Buddhism as of late, and both Chinul and later Gihwa wrote on how they believed Taoism and Neo-Confucianism (at least in the case of Gihwa who was writing during the Joseon) were valid paths.

That does not mean these scholars mistook Taoism and Ne-Confucianism as leading to the same result Buddhadharma purports.

Good luck to you in your search for truth.

I am not searching, but thanks. I am pretty clear about what I think is the real meaning of Buddha's teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

but they qualify those statements to make it clear that the self does exist as mere imputation.

Malcolm wrote:

Which I made clear at the outset. The self exists as an imputation, it does not exist where it is imputed, that is the meaning of "non-existent". The habit of grasping is responsible for that imputation, hence we have the term "the habit of grasping a non-existent self". This habit itself functions as an agent of karma and an object upon which karma ripens, without the self it imputes existing where it is imputed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, could you say more about the truth and freedom you do aspire to?

Malcolm wrote:

Perfect dharmatā is nonarising,
alternately, self-liberated without grasping.

Why? The cause of self-liberation
is unceasing nonattachment.

It is free from a mind of grasping attachment.
Recognize this again and again.
If one familiarizes oneself repeatedly,
one is a person who has seen the truth.
The Self-Risen Vidyā Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

And yet I do not think that accepting Batchelor as a Buddhist and yet publically showing the internal contradictions, fallacies, prejudices and so forth inherent in his positions is a waste of time.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we all make choices.

cloudburst said:

I started out as a materialist and was greatly helped by strong refutations of this materialist view found in my early studies, mostly of Nyingma teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is, Dzogchen texts reject the substance dualism prevalent in virtually the entire Buddhist tradition.

cloudburst said:

It is painful to try and hold a view that cannot be defended, so people move.

Malcolm wrote:

Most people just suck up the party line. It is often difficult enough just to understand that, without understanding why it might be defective or problematical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Koji said:

Just curious, are there differing standards of what Buddhadharma is or just one standard? If just one standard in which tradition or texts can we find it? I think beginners would like to know so we could say something like, "That isn't Buddhism."

Malcolm wrote:

In my opinion basic standards which would indicate a person or a school is Buddhist in orientation are:

A dharma theory based on skandhas, dhātus and āyatanas.

A theory of suffering based on affliction and dependent origination.

A path theory based on śamatha and vipaśyāna.

Acceptance of the four seals.

A concept of refuge.

I think that this basic framework provides a wide latitude for differences of opinion, including for example eternalist interpretations of the tathāgatagarbha sutras or the austere doctrine of emptiness taught in Madhyamaka and Prajñāpāramitā. It even has room for "heretics" like Batchelor and Zenmar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Was Dudjom Rinpoche a gzhan stong pa?

Malcolm wrote:

He was a gzhan stong pa, yes. But not really in the same way that Dolbupa was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

I wouldn't say it is clear cut that this view is an import into Buddhadharma. Many have argued and continue to do so that the Buddha didn't deny the Self but rather used anatta as a via negativa approach to deny reality to the empirical self consisting of the impermanent aggregates. See my post in this thread for some quotes on this:

Malcolm wrote:

What you are suggesting is already found in Samkhya system. I.e. the twenty four tattvas are not the self aka purusha. Since this system was well known to the Buddha, if that's all his insight was, then his insight is pretty trivial. But Buddha's teachings were novel. Why were they novel? They were novel in the fifth century BCE because of his teaching of dependent origination and emptiness. The refutation of an ultimate self is just

collateral damage.

Vidyaraja said:

Now, you are free to disagree, but if this line of thought (which is shared by other scholars like George Grimm, CAF Rhys Davids, Perez-Reimon, Ananda Coomaraswamy, the Thais of the Dhammakaya movement, other Theravadins, etc.) is correct, then the no-self doctrine as applied to Nirvana is an import into Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Their views are important as part of the history of ideas; however, no serious expert in the field of Buddhist studies really holds their theosophically informed opinions in any regard.

Vidyaraja said:

As to saying that this view doesn't bring about realization, I think numerous Hindu sages from the time of the Vedic rishis up to modern figures like Nisargadatta Maharaj, the Christian mystics like Pseudo-Dionysius or Meister Eckhart, the Sufi sheikhs such as Ibn Arabi and Rumi, Neoplatonist mystics like Plotinus and Iamblichus, Taoists like Lao Tzu, Jains like Mahavira, the Sikhs, Kabbalists, various occult figures, and various Amerindians who speak of the Great Spirit, as well as the Buddhist masters like Dolpopa, and various Zen figures like Huang Po would disagree. Now of course, all intellectual views must be transcended to reach the wordless, intuitive, direct realization of Truth, but nonetheless. My point is, while many of these sages aren't Buddhists, the Madhyamika figures who deny the transcendent Absolute and the Great Self are the minority in the spiritual history of mankind.

Malcolm wrote:

But they are clearly defined majority in the annals of Buddhadharma, which is our subject of discussion.

Vidyaraja said:

You are free to believe that they are an elite who have had the highest realization and everyone else has been deluded or of inferior realization, but for one I refuse to believe that is the case, not only because of the unity across time, culture, religion, etc. of those figures who maintained this view, but because of my own experience tells me otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

You are a perennialist. This is fine, but you do realize that your views are a severely minority opinion in Buddhadharma.

It is not a question of higher or lower realization. The fact is that the liberation to which you aspire is not one I share. It does not mean I am going to deny you the right to call yourself a Buddhist because you happen to hold views that I consider to be out of step with the primary trends of the evolution of Buddhist teachings. The fact is that the liberation to which Batchelor aspires is not one I share. The fact is that the liberation to

which the Pure Land people aspire is not one I share. The fact is that the liberation to which the Theravadins aspire is not one I share. The fact is that the liberation to which Zen practitioners aspire is not one I share. But they are all Buddhists and they all aspire to freedom.

Beyond that, the fact is that the liberation to which Samkhya, Vedanta, Yoga, Vaiśeṣika, Nyaya and Mimamsa aspire is not one I share. But they are also seeking freedom, so I consider them Dharma, albeit, not Buddhadharma. The same goes with all other spiritual paths.

We are all alike in that we are seeking truth and freedom that truth brings. But I do not think for an instant that we all seeking the same truth or the same freedom.

The strength of Buddha's patched robe is that it is able to accommodate such disagreement and so many different point of view of about what Buddha himself meant when he discoursed about truth and freedom.

When it comes to tenets, I think Madhyamaka is the most definitive teaching, when it comes to sūtras, think the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras are the most definitive, and I when it comes to vajrayāna, I think Dzogchen is the most definitive teaching. But that is just my perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

This is an english text, so there is no possibility of correcting a translation from a tibetan text.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, you're quoting from the translator's introduction, I understand. Do you take them as authorities though?

smcj said:

If the translators can't get that right, then nothing else in the book is reliable. It is put as something fundamental to be understood before proceeding. Plus this is Dudjom R.'s position repeatedly stated in many contexts. A Google search will demonstrate this.

Malcolm wrote:

The translators did a fine job on that book. The person who didn't get it right was Dudjom Rinpoche. He just repeated a gloss that is found in many earlier books, and he apparently never looked up the original citation to check it. Tibetan scholarship in general is not known for originality, and it is also not known for detailed citation checking. Mostly people just repeat what they hear from their teachers. Great Lamas

are no different in this respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

OK, here's a quote from Dudjom R.'s "The Nyingma School Of Tibetan Buddhism" (a.k.a. "The Red Book") p. 26:

" The Great Madhyamaka (dbu-ma chen-po) is aloof from the reasoning of the Outer Madhyamaka which is based upon dialectics, and instead must be experientially cultivated in meditation. "

Malcolm wrote:

In Bhavya's text, the difference between the so called coarse outer madhyamaka and the inner subtle madhyamaka merely has to do with how relative truth is treated. I reproduce the entire passage below. You will notice an absence of the terms Prasanga, Svatantra. When one, as a Madhyamaka, treats relative truth from the perspective of the śravakas, this is considered coarse outer madhyamaka. When relative truth is treated from the cittamatra point of view, then this becomes the subtle inner madhyamaka:

When phenomenal entities are categorized, in this way there are two kind: material and immaterial. In this way, material entities appearing as portions of subtle atoms do not exist and also subtle atoms appearing as limited by different directions do not exist. They are immaterial mind. Meanwhile, mind and mental factors are engaged for a moment. Since appearing because of the very subtle aspect through the differentiation of past, present and future does not exist, minds and mental factors are not established, becoming the nature of the dharmadhātu, in which one should abide. The Mother states: "That mind is not mind, because the primal nature [prakṛiti] of the mind is luminosity" and "wherever the mind does not exist, that is inconceivable".

Further, all phenomena can be gathered into the mind, mind gathered into the body, after the body is gathered into the dharmadhātu, it dissolves. The meaning of this is also spoken of by the Ācārya Nāgārjuna in the Madhyamaka Bhāvaśaṃkranta:

The world comes from concepts; concepts come from the mind;

the mind is supported on the body, for that reason investigate the body.

One should dwell in such a meaning. Do not dwell on any kind of occasion or consciousness. Do not conceive anything, do not think about anything, do not dwell all extremes. The essence of any consciousness has not arisen, one should meditate on nothing at all. Further, that prajñā of through analysis does not appear. For example, since fire is produced by rubbing sticks together vigorously, if the wood is burnt, also that fire is understood to naturally pacified, because it also has become non-existent. The meaning of this can be understood in the Ārya-kāśyapaparivarta sūtra.

Further, in the Ārya-ghanavyūha sūtra:

Just the fire which is the burning agent does not exist
since the burnt object does not exist,
likewise if one burns the view to be incinerated,
also the fire of emptiness will cease.
At the time of the cessation of views,
the fire of wisdom will not be produced,
all afflictions having been incinerated.
If the afflictions are incinerated, the aspect is beautiful.
Mahāsukha (aka Padmavajra) says:
Having burned the bundle of firewood of views
with the fire of emptiness,
this is abiding in peace,
in which the fire of suchness has also ceased.
As such, having taught the coarse yoga, now the subtle yoga will be taught. This is
subtle i.e. all dharmas there can be arise as the appearances of one's mere illusory
mind itself. In this way, the mere illusory mind is beyond the three times. Without color
or shape, luminous through its primal nature. Since it does not appear, all phenomena
are to be understood as being the illusory mind itself. There are also citations. The Ārya
Lankāvatara states:
In dependance on mind-only,
do not analyze outer objects;
in dependence upon suchness
one must transcend mind-only.
If one transcends mind-only,
one will abide in non-appearances.
The yogi abiding in non-appearances,
he sees the Mahāyāna.
Ārya Nāgārjuna, Ācārya Āryadeva, Ācārya Candrakīrti speak it in these words. In this
way, speaking about the relative truth in the manner of the śravakas is the coarse outer
madhyamaka. That [relative] existing as one's mind only is the so called "inner
madhyamaka" which is subtle.

There are three things to include here: one, this author, Bhavya, is very late -- he is not
the same author as Bhavaviveka. This is proven by two things: one, he mentions
Candrakīrti. Second, he cites Mahasukha aka Padmavajra and directly cites
Padmavajra's text Sakalatantrasambhavaśaṃcodanī-śrīguhyasiddhi-nama. Padmavajra
may be the same person as Padmasambhava.

At any rate, this text itself is no later than the tenth century but no earlier than the eighth.
This places Bhavya subsequent to Padmavajra, that and Atisha brought the text to Tibet
in the 11th.

Third, Bhavya mentions a great madhyamaka three times in this text. But first person we
know of to use the term in any surviving text was the Tibetan Kawa Paltseg. He uses the
term great madhyamaka as a sobriquet for freedom from extremes.

So frankly, when gzhan stong pas use this passage from Bhavya to support their notion

that great madhyamaka is a non-analytical meditation, their reasoning is pretty flimsy when the citation they use to distinguish an outer and an inner madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 20th, 2013 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, unfortunately, this citation does not actually exist in the text it is supposed to exist in. I have mentioned this before and I am pretty sure I presented the original passage out of which this oft cited distortion is from.

dzogchungpa said:

That's disturbing. How did find it's way into that book then?

Malcolm wrote:

It is an interpretive gloss of a passage treated as a citation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

If you want my humble opinion, that is largely what much of Madhyamika, concepts like emptiness as often understood, no ultimate ground of being, anatta understood as applying to the Absolute rather than as a via negativa applied to the aggregates, and so forth are: the intellectual ideas of philosophers...

No, it is the opposite actually, in my opinion, those people within Buddhadharma who assert a transcendent absolute, a mahātman, etc. are the intellectuals since they are the ones who have to spin the most elaborate hermeneutics to justify their opinions, for example Dolbuba.

Here's a cut and paste from something Dudjom R. wrote. He starts by quoting somebody else:

Concerning the subtle, inner Great Madhyamaka of definitive meaning, it is stated in the Jewel Lamp of the Madhyamaka by the master Bhavya (skal-ldan):

The Madhyamaka of the Prasangika and the Svatantrika is the coarse, Outer Madhyamaka. It should indeed be expressed by those who profess well-informed intelligence during debates with [extremist] Outsiders, during the composition of great treatises, and while establishing texts which concern supreme reasoning. However, when the subtle, inner Madhyamaka is experientially cultivated, one should meditate on the nature of Yogacara-Madhyamaka.

Elsewhere I've seen him say that Prasangika Madhyamaka is for intellectual approach to emptiness and Great Madyamaka (Shentong) is for discussing it from a meditational standpoint without quoting anybody else, but this is what I found with a quick search.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, unfortunately, this citation does not actually exist in the text it is supposed to exist in. I have mentioned this before and I am pretty sure I presented the original passage out of which this oft cited distortion is from.

I will shortly present it again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Son of Buddha said:

can you source this in the Sutras for us all??

(I could of swore the texts that teach Buddha Nature say it is Not-Empty)

Malcolm wrote:

It is more complicated than that. I spent a few minutes this morning running a word search on the bka' 'gyur and I found that only five of the ten tathagatagarbhasūtras say anything at all about the dharmadhātu, and only four of them say anything meaningful.

The Angulimāla sūtra says:

The dhātu of all sentient beings (sarvasattvadhātu) is the dharmadhātu, since flesh is consumed of the same dhātu, the buddhas do not consume meat. It is presented in the context of eating meat. Basically, cannibalism is a taboo in general, and by making the observation that the dharmadhātu is the sattvadhātu, in this sūtra the Buddha is making an argument we ought not eat meat since we are all of the same kind.

The Nirvana Sūtra only contains two explicit mentions of the dharmadhātu:

Empty peace is the dharmadhātu...

Son of a good family, if one of average prajñā truly courses in the dharmadhātu, wisdom of perfection, ultimate truth and ultimate emptiness, that one will attain the śravakas awakening; the one of medium prajñā, the pratyekabuddha awakening, and one is best prajñā, unsurpassed awakening.

There is another sūtra, Ārya-maladevīśiṃhanāda sūtra, that states:

"Bhagavan, this tathāgatagarbha is the sublime dharmadhātu. It is the dharmakāyagarbha, it is the garbha of transcendent phenomena [lokkotaradharmas], it is the garbha of the naturally pure dharmakāya. Bhagavan, since temporary secondary afflictions are naturally pure as the tathāgatagarbha, these secondary afflictions are the site of the tathāgatas."

This sutra pretty clearly states that afflicted phenomena cannot be excluded from the tathāgatagarbha, more or less repeating the thinking of the Angulimala sūtra above.

Ok, therefore, we can see that that tathagatagarbha sūtras are of no help in defining dharmadhātu.

The Ārya-gaṇanāgarīparipṛcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra is the likely locus classicus for the explicit notion that the dharmadhātu is a source. Let me preface this by saying that in Tibetan, the term "dhātu" is glossed as a 'byung gnas, a locus of production, not as a basis or a foundation [gzhi/rtsa ba]. The nature of meaning of the term dhātu is translated into is "dbyings", which has a native meaning as a dimension [klong] or a element [khams]. When it is defined by Vasubandhu he defines the term dhātu as being similar to a mine. Now, the sūtra states:

Phenomena do not come and do not go, they dwell in the dharmadhātu;
all that appears as form, it all comes from space;
all that appears as phenomena[dharmas], those come from the dharmadhātu.
Still we are no closer to a conclusive definition of dharmadhātu.

The Lankāvatara helps us: Suchness, emptiness, nirvana and the dharmadhātu, the non-arising phenomena, are nature of the ultimate.
So here in this text we have a clear demonstration that suchness, emptiness, nirvana and the dharmadhātu are all to be treated as synonymous.

The Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā states: Further, because the dharmadhātu does not exist, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the past; because the dharmadhātu is emptiness, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the past; because the dharmadhātu is isolated it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the past; because the dharmadhātu lacks an intrinsic nature, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the past. Further, because the dharmadhātu does not exist, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the future; because the dharmadhātu is emptiness, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the future; because the dharmadhātu is isolated it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the future; because the dharmadhātu lacks an intrinsic nature, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the extreme of the future. Further, because the dharmadhātu does not exist, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the middle; because the dharmadhātu is emptiness, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the middle; because the dharmadhātu is isolated it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the middle; because the dharmadhātu lacks an intrinsic nature, it is not perceived by the bodhisattvas in the middle.

So in reality, we see that in the Tathagatagarbha sūtra cycle, the notion of dharmadhātu is rather neglected doctrinally; I would suggest, precisely because of its association with emptiness as presented in the PP sūtras, which in no way permits a reading of a positive ground which serves as the basis for the arising of phenomena. And as we have seen above, the Nirvana sūtra explicitly defines dharmadhātu as emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 2:19 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

So for me, transcendence and a timeless, unborn Absolute reality that is the source of everything

Malcolm wrote:

Conditioned phenomena dependently originate; unconditioned phenomena do not arise at all. Other than that, there is no source. This is why dependent origination is called "profound". The logic of dependent origination precludes a "source" for conditioned phenomena, transcendent or otherwise.

Your view is just one among many imports into Buddhadharma, just like Batchelor's views. In my opinion you are both mistaken -- but that does not really matter, because intellectual views like yours and Batchelors, in the end, are not what bring about realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 2:15 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

oushi said:

That would be true only if you give a special meaning to "nature".

Malcolm wrote:

The word here is *svabhāva* i.e. nature, inherent existence, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 2:12 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But people have a hard time with the kind of intellectual discipline the study of the Buddhist history of ideas demands.

Vidyaraja said:

If you want my humble opinion, that is largely what much of Madhyamika, concepts like emptiness as often understood, no ultimate ground of being, anatta understood as applying to the Absolute rather than as a *via negativa* applied to the aggregates, and so forth are: the intellectual ideas of philosophers...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is the opposite actually, in my opinion, those people within Buddhadharma who assert a transcendent absolute, a mahātman, etc. are the intellectuals since they are the ones who have to spin the most elaborate hermeneutics to justify their opinions, for example Dolbuba.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Since everything is empty, it is often said that everything arises from the dharmadhātu and dissolves into the dharmadhātu. It is an ocean/wave metaphor.

Sounds more like "there's an ultimate ground of being" metaphor.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really.

But people have a hard time with the kind of intellectual discipline the study of the Buddhist history of ideas demands.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no fundamental ground of existence which gives rise to everything.

dzogchungpa said:

Isn't dharmadhatu something like this?

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahāyāna, the dharmadhātu is merely synonym for the general state of emptiness that pervades all things. Since everything is empty, it is often said that everything arises from the dharmadhātu and dissolves into the dharmadhātu. It is an ocean/wave metaphor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

Where is an 'unconditioned phenomena'? Show me one 'unconditioned phenomena'.

This is something I say you cannot do - there is no such thing anywhere.
If you believe Asanga, you own Buddha Nature is unconditioned phenomena. It is your own nature, yet cannot be taken as an object of consciousness, yours or anybody else's for that matter. It is an example of something unborn having functionality--the functionality being you!

Malcolm wrote:

If you believe the Buddha as he is presented in the Lankāvatara sutra, tathāgatagarbha is merely an intermediate doctrine for those who are frightened of emptiness.

-

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

I suppose to put it in plain English, I believe in the reality of 'spirit'. 'Spirit' is a most unfortunate word, mostly misunderstood and usually maligned, but there is nothing else in English, unfortunately. Tibetans tend to use 'Mind' to denote that reality, the fundamental ground of existence, that which gives rise to everything. There seem to be many here who deny it. It's a shame, but I will put forward the opposing view from time to time, so that those reading will know that there are some don't acquiesce to this notion that the tathagatha is 'only the five aggregates'.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no fundamental ground of existence which gives rise to everything. This idea is a modern import into Buddhism. I mean, it is fine if you subscribe to it, but you won't find it in a Buddhist sutra or tantra.

As Ārya Nāgārjuna put it succinctly;

Whatever is the nature of the Tathāgata, that is the nature of the world;
since the Tathāgata has no nature, the world has no nature.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is a dharma. It is not beyond phenomena, it is a phenomena albeit, an unconditioned phenomena.

jeeprs said:

Where is an 'unconditioned phenomena'? Show me one 'unconditioned phenomena'.
This is something I say you cannot do - there is no such thing anywhere.

Malcolm wrote:

There are three kinds of unconditioned phenomena (asamskritadharma) we find in Buddhist texts: space and the two kinds of cessation. Of these two last, one is mere absence of a cause for arising, and the second is nirvana i.e. a cessation which is due to analysis.

In Mahāyāna a fourth is added i.e. śūnyatā, emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 6:32 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

There is reality beyond existence and non-existence. It can't be spoken of directly because it is not amongst phenomena and so does not exist in the same way phenomena do.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense. All phenomenon [dharmas], both conditioned and unconditioned are included in one skandha, one āyatana, and one dhātu. The skandha is the material aggregate because it includes all material sense objects and sense organs; the āyatana is the mano-ayatana, which includes all minds; and the dharmadhātu which includes all mental factors, as well as the unconditioned dharmas, including nirvana. Nirvana is a dharma. It is not beyond phenomena, it is a phenomena albeit, an unconditioned phenomena.

jeeprs said:

'Not existent' - the source of existence is not among the things that exist. But it is not non-existent - it is not mere absence, mere nothingness, but the 'basis of all samsara and nirvana'. It is not simply nothing, mere cessation, absence, even though it is very easy to interpret that way.

Malcolm wrote:

This, my friend, is very far away from the meaning intended by Rangjung Dorje.

jeeprs said:

That is not 'eternalism' but a re-statement of the perennial idea of 'the eternal' within the human being.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing eternal within a human being. A human beings consists of five aggregates and nothing more. if there something eternal within a human, that would be

a self.

avidyā is not held to be the cause of existence in dependent origination, because that would make ignorance/avidyā unconditioned itself.

In other words, it is a metaphysical concept.

You need to examine a clear explanation of the twelve nidanas. Of course, you like everyone, are free to invent whatever Buddhism you want out of whole cloth.

Just don't be so convinced that your pet theories are really the truth (tm).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

It seems like the word 'habit' is doing all the heavy lifting here.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, indeed it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dude said:

How can something that doesn't exist function?

cloudburst said:

the self does of course exist conventionally, allowing it to function. That's what Malcolm actually means when he says "the habit of grasping a non-existent self" in his post. He refuses to admit that explicitly, however if you press the point it will become clear.

Malcolm wrote:

What exists is an imputation of a self. We have to discover if this conventional self is one of the aggregates, all of them, or merely imputed upon them? And if it is merely imputed upon the aggregates, is this imputation veridical or merely functional? If this imputation is not veridical, then this means that the imputation is false and the self being imputed does not exist except as an imputation.

What does not exist is a self which function as a basis for that imputation. The basis for the imputation of a self is the appearance of a person constituted to our senses primarily as a rūpa skandha. We can infer the existence of the other four skandhas if that rūpa skandha gives evidence of being able to think and act. At first, we imagine that person has an identity, such as cloudburst or malcolm; but there is nothing within the

five aggregates that will correspond in any way to the designations "cloudburst" and "malcolm".

The term "the habit of grasping a non-existent self" is a very precise way of describing how an imputed self (which does not exist in the aggregates, separate from them, or as one of them) may be an agent while also being a nonexistent. This is precisely the Prasangika method of describing how rebirth functions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

noooo, can't be. You are here opposing what you consider to be incorrect veiws, so your own claim is not credible. Nagarjuna did it, Buddha did it, Shantideva, Chandrkiriti, Longchenpa, Rongdzon, Mipham, Mikkyo Dorje, Sapan...

Malcolm wrote:

I am not opposing incorrect views in the manner in which you imagine, the tiered structure of tenets where the ultimate of the lower is the conventional of the higher.

I am here merely pointing out that it is foolish to deny Batchelor status as a Buddhist because we don't like his views about rebirth.

Secondly, many scholars in the past have written many refutations in the past; but in general the only people who have accepted these refutations have been the students of these polemicists, who merely repeat blindly what their masters have told them is "correct view".

One must discover for oneself what a "correct view" might be. One may arrive at some conviction about what correct view is; one might even willing to argue about it a little bit; but in reality, one cannot impose upon others a correct view, even with recourse to citation and reasoning.

In other words, one can only establish correct view for oneself; one cannot establish for others, for example, via a reasoning such as a syllogism (an inference for another).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dude said:

How can something that doesn't exist function?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, now you are screwed. If you cannot accept that functionality of the habit of imputing a non-existence self, which in turn functions as an agent, you need to propose an existing agent to explain rebirth which is not a mere habit of grasping a self, and if you do that, you will end up with a mass of contradictions. For example, you might try and propose consciousness as an agent of rebirth (ala Bhavaviveka), but that presents a lot of problems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

Actually, this is an Indian Madhaymaka "game," intially. See my quote above where Chandrakirti explicitly disagrees with you.

Malcolm wrote:

One citation does not prove that Candrakirti disagrees with me.

Basically, if you assert there is an ultimate unborn entity [the subject of my negation] beyond existence and non-existence [the premise of Vidyārāja's assertion], since such an entity does not arise it does not exist.

Vidyārāja's nirvana is something beyond what he considered the conditioned. Its classic Buddhist eternalism.

cloudburst said:

What is it that you are saying is a waste of time? Refuting incorrect views?

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, pretty much. They are not really refuted through reasoning but are dispelled only through realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not one person, even Batchelor, denies that Buddha talked about rebirth. There is a lot of disagreement over the what he meant when he did talk about it. For example,

Buddhadassa's point of view is that we have to separate what "rebirth" means as a technical term in Dharma, as opposed to what it means in every day speech, asserting that to interpret rebirth as in every day language is violently at odds with the Buddha's real intention. As I mentioned above, Pudgalavadins claimed there is an inexpressible self responsible for transmigration. Jamgon Kongtrul sees clear light or luminosity as the kernel which transmigrates and so on.

dzogchungpa said:

Honestly, has this point ever been definitively clarified by the tradition? Malcolm you say you accept rebirth. How do you define and explain it?

Malcolm wrote:

I understand the mechanism of rebirth in a couple of ways. First, the habit of grasping a non-existent self leads to the appropriation of aggregates in which a self cannot be found. This non-existent self can function as an agent and recipient of karma.

The second has to do with tantric anatomy and principles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dude said:

I maintain that the principles of karma and transmigration (the appearance, disappearance and reappearance in different forms) are irreducible tenets of the Buddha's teaching, to be found in the higher, lower, "earlier and later" teachings with total consistency.

I don't think it's debatable, the words of the sutras are what they are.

To deny this is to slander the Buddha, by the Buddha's own definition : "One who claims the Thus Come One did not say what he said slanders the Thus Come One."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not one person, even Batchelor, denies that Buddha talked about rebirth. There is a lot of disagreement over the what he meant when he did talk about it. For example, Buddhadassa's point of view is that we have to separate what "rebirth" means as a technical term in Dharma, as opposed to what it means in every day speech, asserting that to interpret rebirth as in every day language is violently at odds with the Buddha's real intention. As I mentioned above, Pudgalavadins claimed there is an inexpressible self responsible for transmigration. Jamgon Kongtrul sees clear light or luminosity as the kernel which transmigrates and so on.

Batchelor is very much in tune with Buddhadassa's interpretation of emptiness and selflessness.

dude said:

Then they should explain what they mean. What I've seen so far from proponents of this

line of thinking is not only unsatisfactory, it's absurd.

Malcolm wrote:

You should read the link to Buddhadasa's teaching. He explains his point of view very clearly. I don't agree with him, but I am not going exile him from Buddhist intellectual history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

cloudburst said:

This is an important point.

Malcolm wrote:

You just proved my point, since Vidyārāja was talking about "ultimately" Nirvana is beyond existence and non-existence. He was not playing into your Gelug "Great Madhyamaka" game where emptiness [an absence] exists conventionally.

cloudburst said:

I think you are wrong, Malcolm, in saying that he is teaching a profound skepticism. He actually sneers and scoffs at the notion of rebirth, and I think much of what he says is harmful. All interpretative views are meant to be refuted by higher views, and eventually by definitive views, so I think we can accept Batchelor as a Buddhist while refuting his incorrect views.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said his skepticism was profound, just that he was skeptical. My point exactly is that we can accept someone as a Buddhist, even if we vehemently disagree with their views even on fundamental principles.

cloudburst said:

If anyone really wants to have this debate, I'm up for it, (should be moved to another thread, I think) but I think its evident if you read Batchelor, he does actively deny rebirth. This means he denies any meaningful interpretation of karma, and also the existence of course of other realms. So in the Batchelordharma, there are no thoughts that turn the mind, no future worlds, no renunciation of samsara since it has been incorrectly identified, no bodhicitta etc..., its a travesty.

Malcolm wrote:

His is a very narrow, selective interpretation of early Buddhism. But he is still a Buddhist, and that was my point.

cloudburst said:

Let it benefit those for whom it is beneficial.

Malcolm wrote:

Its a waste of time, actually. All it does is convince one's own disciples.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

To be honest, I am tired of debating you so I won't continue the debate any further. If you wish to take that as triumph, feel free to do so. However, I think that article by B. Alan Wallace sums up quite nicely why Batchelorism isn't Buddhism, so I will let that do the talking for me. That said, I must ask, is your personal Buddhism based entirely on philosophy or have you had any direct experience? I ask because if you had any direct experience, I am not sure how you could possibly defend Batchelor, which isn't to say that I think he is defensible purely from a philosophical or doctrinal understanding of Buddhism either.

Malcolm wrote:

I am defending Batchelor based on the principle that Buddha's Dharma robe was cobbled together from patches of rags -- which represents his disciples, and their inability to agree with each other in the future.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

dude said:

I maintain that the principles of karma and transmigration (the appearance, disappearance and reappearance in different forms) are irreducible tenets of the Buddha's teaching, to be found in the higher, lower, "earlier and later" teachings with total consistency.

I don't think it's debatable, the words of the sutras are what they are.

To deny this is to slander the Buddha, by the Buddha's own definition : "One who claims the Thus Come One did not say what he said slanders the Thus Come One."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not one person, even Batchelor, denies that Buddha talked about rebirth. There is a lot of disagreement over the what he meant when he did talk about it. For example, Buddhadasa's point of view is that we have to separate what "rebirth" means as a technical term in Dharma, as opposed to what it means in every day speech, asserting that to interpret rebirth as in every day language is violently at odds with the Buddha's real intention. As I mentioned above, Pudgalavadins claimed there is an inexpressible self responsible for transmigration. Jamgon Kongtrul sees clear light or luminosity as the kernal which transmigrates and so on.

Batchelor is very much in tune with Buddhadasa's interpretation of emptiness and selflessness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 19th, 2013 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Something that has not arisen [unborn] does not exist. If you accept that nirvana is unborn, you also accept that it does not exist. If you propose it exists, your view is no different than Hindus who believe in a permanent, unborn purusha.

Vidyaraja said:

It is not an existent to be found somewhere phenomenally. It is beyond existence and non-existence. Of course on an ultimate level it is beyond words and concepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Something beyond existence and non-existence is a non-existent by definition.

The fourth seal is merely that nirvana is peaceful. As we have seen, there are all kinds of Buddhist understandings of nirvana -- many of which flat out contradict each other. Moreover, the fourth seal does not exist in Theravada, it is a Mahāyāna interpolation. Yes, and if the material world is all that exists, then dukkha is all there is. Nirvana won't be found holding the view that Batchelor has as mentioned in the interview a few posts back, and if somehow it were, I guarantee that the one who awakened will repudiate his former materialist views.

You still have not adequately addressed even a single point I have brought up. Your reasoning is flawed, BTW. Nirvana is merely the cessation of afflictive patterning aka dukkha.

Buddhists for centuries have accused other Buddhists of "corrupting" the Dharma and indulging in superstitions. Still, you would accept Vajrayāna practitioners as Buddhists, no? How about Mahāyāna Buddhists -- they have many things that could be labeled "superstitions" by Theravādins, for example. Buddhists have accused each of false beliefs and incorrect interpretations for centuries.

All those Buddhists you mentioned accepted that the goal of Buddhism is to transcend the wheel of birth and death, which Batchelor denies.

No, Batchelor accepts that the goal of Buddhism as taught by the Buddha is to transcend birth and death. He also thinks that Buddhism has other, more immediate goals, like living a mindful ethical life based on the eight fold path. What he refuses to do is be drawn into metaphysical debates about such questions as rebirth.

However benign their intentions, their writings may be regarded as "near enemies" of

Buddhism.

I think this is just polemics, just as wrongheaded as your fatwas.

You are merely flinging around a reactionary term you have not defined. What kind of materialist is Batchelor: money, cars and sex? Is he a dialectical materialist?

As defined by twentieth century philosophers William James and Alfred North Whitehead, for instance, scientific materialism is the belief that physical reality, as made available to the natural sciences, is all that truly exist.

What Batchelor stated in the interview previously also touches on what is meant by the term.

I don't think you can pin Batchelor down that easily.

Basically, all you have demonstrated in this thread is that you cannot prove that Batchelor views are in contradiction to three of the most basic tenets of Buddhadharma:

all conditioned things are impermanent
all defiled things are suffering
everything lacks a self.

Batchelor accepts the four noble truths:

suffering
cause
cessation
and the path.

He just does not do so in a way that is appealing to Buddhist dogmatists.

Look, I have argued your side of this before and at length and in detail. But it is a losing argument — why? Because there are many things in many Buddhist teachings that have been regarded as heretical by someone.

The fact is, and you are just going to have to accept it — is that there are a large number of people out there who practice Zen and Vipassana who nevertheless do not accept rebirth. There are even many Nicherin Buddhists who deny that rebirth is a fact. When you take this hard position that "this is the really the teaching of the Buddha" you put yourself in a corner. The strength of the Dharma lies in the fact that it is a method of discovering the truth. We don't lay out the truth in the beginning and say "this is what you must confirm in order to be considered a Buddhist." If this were the case, we could not even have the discussion "Early Buddhism and Mahāyāna". Why? Because the Mahāyāna Buddhists themselves introduced heresies into Buddhism, heresies clearly defined in Abhidharma literatures. Then we have the heresies of Vajrayāna. Then Dzogchen. Then Bon. Then Nicherin Buddhism. Then Chan, Zen, etc.

All we can do really is say "That person's Buddhism is not for me". For example, your eternalist disposition is not for me. I am sure that Dzogchen is not to your liking. So what? Some people like Batchelor's "metaphysics free" approach. They would not even explore Buddhadharma otherwise.

We all have ignorance. All of our views are limited. Even the most perfect mental model of how things are is not how things are. This is why it is more useful to focus on the methods of Dharma and discover for ourselves what we can perceive and what we can infer. We really ought not be telling people like Batchelor that they have no right to call themselves Buddhist. It opens up oneself to the same charge. Our conceptual map is not really that relevant to our practice unless it is causing us suffering and preventing us from practicing. I don't think that practicing Dharma has much to do with our conceptual beliefs. Everyone wants to wake up. How is demonizing Batchelor helping you or anyone else given that you are no more an authority than he is, or Wallace, or me?

As far as I can tell, you don't understand Batchelor's point of view very well. I think it comes from his training in Korean Zen. He is putting it out there that there are many questions the answers to which he does not know and does not feel anyone can know without claiming special knowledge. I respect that position. It is really honest. There is a lot of dishonesty in religious discourse. People claiming as truths things they have merely heard or read and not personally experienced is the essence of dishonesty. This is why I find the polemics against Batchelor incredibly dishonest. Not one person who is criticizing Batchelor has any personal experience or realization of these so called "truths" they are enunciating.

For example, in his book Heartwood, Bhikku Buddhadasa completely rejects literal rebirth as a fiction of the Abhidhammists. Are you going to say that Buddhadasa is not a Buddhist? He says elsewhere:

If we use the Kalama Sutta and the Four Criteria, we can strictly apply the Buddha's principle to choose the right things from layers upon layers of garbage. This is not to say that all of the essays and canons are useless, but that the Buddha's principle must be strictly applied to find the right explanations. According to the Four Criteria, anything that is not in accord with the Doctrine [dhamma] and Discipline [vinaya] should be considered as erroneous hearing, memory, speech, and teaching. The doctrine of dependent origination is primarily intended to abolish the concept of a continuing existence and nihilism. Therefore, if the teaching of the doctrine involves man's transmigration in three lifetimes, then it is unacceptable in accordance with the Four Criteria.

[http://www.what-buddha-](http://www.what-buddha-taught.net/Books6/Bhikkhu_Buddhadasa_Paticcasamuppada.htm)

[taught.net/Books6/Bhikkhu_Buddhadasa_Paticcasamuppada.htm](http://www.what-buddha-taught.net/Books6/Bhikkhu_Buddhadasa_Paticcasamuppada.htm)

So you see, there are a lot of people, intelligent people, who feel that we can interpret Buddha's teaching in such a way that even proposing literal rebirth is actually opposed to Buddha's intention! But of course, according to you, they are not Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

That which transcends time is timeless and unborn, not eternal in the sense of endless time.

Malcolm wrote:

Something that has not arisen [unborn] does not exist. If you accept that nirvana is unborn, you also accept that it does not exist. If you propose it exists, your view is no different than Hindus who believe in a permanent, unborn purusha.

BTW, there are many people who think Dolpopa's view i.e. gzhan stong, is a corrupt view of Buddhadharma.

Let's use a different enlightened master then. Here is something from Huang Po, brackets are mine:

One, I am not sure that translation you are using is reliable. Two, there are a lot of people who have a big problem with the "true self" and "one mind" language and so on that exists in Zen -- who see it as again, crypto -Advaita.

The fourth seal is that of nirvana, which isn't to be found in materialism.

The fourth seal is merely that nirvana is peaceful. As we have seen, there are all kinds of Buddhist understandings of nirvana -- many of which flat out contradict each other.

Moreover, the fourth seal does not exist in Theravada, it is a Mahāyāna interpolation.

What we need to understand about Batchelor, for example, and many Westerners like him, is that they are trying.

Yes, trying to corrupt Buddhism and turn it into a form of secular-atheistic materialism, going so far as making claims that teachings Buddha preached and all Buddhists have accepted historically are superstitions.

Buddhists for centuries have accused other Buddhists of "corrupting" the Dharma and indulging in superstitions. Still, you would accept Vajrayāna practitioners as Buddhists, no? How about Mahāyāna Buddhists -- they have many things that could be labeled "superstitions" by Theravadins, for example. Buddhists have accused each of false beliefs and incorrect interpretations for centuries.

At the end of the day however, eventually these new heretical Buddhist trends become accepted and canonized.

While it is true that Buddhism is based on direct experience, most Buddhist masters I've read emphasize the need for faith in the possibility of enlightenment and the efficacy of the Buddhist path in order to be successful.

What you need is *śraddhā* which is defined as mental clarity. You need the mental clarity to understand that exploring the Buddha's teachings will help you end your own

suffering in this life.

Accepting materialism (nihilism) posing as Buddhism as a new understanding of Dharma isn't generous but erroneous and harmful.

You are merely flinging around a reactionary term you have not defined. What kind of materialist is Batchelor: money, cars and sex? Is he a dialectical materialist?

There is nothing in Batchelor's writings to indicate that he has decided that consciousness is solely a result of material interactions. Merely that he has personally abandoned all metaphysical speculations about rebirth and such questions, and feels that in the context of Buddha's teaching of anatman, Buddha's accounts of rebirth are largely mythological, generated with respect to the milieu Buddha was teaching in. I think he even grants that Buddha may have believed these stories. But his point, one to which I now agree, is that the practice of Buddhadharma does not depend on accepting the Jatakas as literally true, or accepting the Buddha's account as having been the first human king in a past life, and so on.

That being said, I imagine that Batchelor probably is a physicalist, but that is different than being a materialist.

Batchelor generally says a perfectly respectable thing: consciousnesses arise based on specific conditions. When you study Abhidharma you will discover that in Abhidharma (as well as Madhyamaka in general) claim that without a sense organ and a sense object, a consciousness cannot arise. It is never said that without a consciousness and a sense organ, the object won't arise, or that without the sense object, the sense organ won't arise. All these texts clearly state that a consciousness arises only when there is a functioning sense organ and a sense object. This is a perfectly reasonable thing to assert in the context of Buddhism.

So this is another area in which your attempt at blackballing Batchelor fails utterly.

So I can either blackball you for having an eternalist view of nirvana and blackball Batchelor for not accepting the doctrine of rebirth literally or I can be expansive and understand that even though you both suffer from some wrong views, you both are still within the Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

smcj said:

his physicalism does not preclude nirvana. He can experience nirvana whether he believes in rebirth or not, providing he relinquishes his afflictions. His position is that belief in rebirth is irrelevant to the cessation of suffering.

Is not "liberation" freedom from cyclic existence (a.k.a. samsara), the cycle of rebirth?

That's pretty fundamental if one buys the original 4 Noble Truths position that dukha pervades all of life.

Malcolm wrote:

You do not have to accept rebirth literally to accept "sarva dukkham". If the solution to suffering in this life is calming the mind with shamatha and developing the insight which burns away afflictions (it is), then what does believing in rebirth have to do with it?

If you have ended your afflictions you won't take rebirth again, according to Buddha's teachings, anyway. So what does it matter? All that matters is that one sees through the matrix of conditions that create your suffering here and now.

This is the minimum requirement.

So, in this thread, we have seen three things:

- 1) The four seals do not require belief in rebirth
- 2) Refuge in the Three Jewels do not require belief in rebirth
- 3) Belief in an eternal unconditioned ultimate is not a requirement to be a Buddhist.

In reality, no beliefs of any kind are required to enter the Buddha's path.

What we need to understand about Batchelor, for example, and many Westerners like him, is that they are trying. They are inspired by the Buddha's example, and they accept what makes sense to them.

Buddhadharma is not about belief and faith. Ultimately, like all Indian yogic paths, it is about personal experience: direct perception and inferences derived from those based on one's practice. It is a personal journey, not one that exists in a catechism. There is no "bible" in Buddhadharma. Rather, Buddhadharma holds a range of teachings from belief in an inexpressible self which is neither the same nor different than aggregates [pudgalavadins] to the crypto Vedantic musings of Dolbupa, to the explicit refutation of the unconditioned by Nāgārjuna and the assertion that nirvana is a non-existent [sautrantikas].

So now, Buddhists, you have to make room for a new understanding of Dharma, one that does not include rebirth as a vital central principle. It won't kill you to be generous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

jeeprs said:

is 'the basis' physical? Is it something known to science?

I would have thought that 'the Buddha's opinion', whether he is 'around to tell us or not'

is pretty well summed up in the idea of 'dependent origination'. If you take dependent origination out, what remains is not in any way shape or form Buddhism, as far as I can tell.

And 'dependent origination' presumes that 'the cause of existence is ignorance' (avidya). I can't see how 'ignorance' is not a metaphysical idea, and indeed the whole basis of dependent origination is not something that Western science would be able to validate.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see Batchelor discarding dependent origination, he states:

The Buddha awakened to a glittering plurality of endlessly arising and vanishing phenomena. No God created it; no Mind underpins it; no Unconditioned lies somewhere outside it. Ethics, meditation and wisdom are not founded on some absolute truth, but grow out of a careful examination of what causes suffering and what brings it to an end.

I differ with Batchelor in that I accept rebirth. But I do not see how the above violates some sacred Buddhist principles resulting in the fatwa Vidyārāja has pronounced above.

BTW, avidyā is not held to be the cause of existence in dependent origination, because that would make ignorance/avidyā unconditioned itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

The unconditioned, i.e. nirvana, which leads to the cessation of suffering, is transcendent.

Malcolm wrote:

Since the Sautrantikas strictly define nirvana as a cessation, a non-existence, would you deny them the claim they are Buddhist because they do not support your eternalist vision of nirvana?

Batchelor feels that his view is dependent origination. He derives that view from the Buddha. Dependent origination is the essence of the Buddhist view for most people.

BTW, there are many people who think Dolpopa's view i.e. gzhan stong, is a corrupt view of Buddhadharma.

So there are two things which are not mentioned in the four seals: belief in rebirth, and belief in a transcendent existent nirvana. These two beliefs of yours are not required in order to consider someone a follower of the Buddha's teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

The path of dharma is so vast and takes such effort to master.

Malcolm wrote:

Seven years, according to Sakya Pandita. Dharma is not rocket science, though we like to pretend it is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He just has problems with literal rebirth because he is a physicalist, just as you are a substance dualist. From my point of view, you are both wrong.

dzogchungpa said:

What is your take on the issue?

Malcolm wrote:

mind and matter are both products of the same basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

The deathless is not to be found among conditioned phenomena:

...

Batchelor's materialism precludes this. He isn't a Buddhist as he cuts out the very heart of Buddhism. Regarding rebirth, see [here](#):

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are incorrect, his physicalism does not preclude nirvana. He can experience nirvana whether he believes in rebirth or not, providing he relinquishes his afflictions. His position is that belief in rebirth is irrelevant to the cessation of suffering.

Vidyaraja said:
I am not a substance dualist.

Malcolm wrote:
Sure you are -- you accept rebirth don't you? And you accept that nama and rūpa are distinct in kind and substance don't you?

As to what "being in line with the Dharma" means, it is impossible to say what the Buddha's opinion is, isn't it? He is not around to tell us.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 2:27 AM
Title: Re: Prophecy of Buddhism's Downfall in India
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Yes, there are similar predictions, for example in the Manjushri Root Tantra, if memory serves me correct.

Indrajala said:
When approximately was the first version translated into Tibetan?

Malcolm wrote:
late 10th, early eleventh century.

Here is one such passage, from chapter 24:

ཀླ་བི་ཤེ་དང་བག་ཁ་ལ། མོ་རྟེ་ཡ་ནི་ཁོར་ཡུག་ཡུལ། ཁ་ཆེ་དང་ནི་སྤྱི་ཡུལ། ཁ་བ་ཅན་གྱི་མཚམས་ཀྱན་དང་། བྱང་
ཕྱོགས་སུ་ནི་གནས་བརྟེན་ལ། དག་བའི་ཕྱགས་ནི་འགྲུབ་པར་འགྱུར། ཁང་ཡང་སངས་རྒྱས་ཐོན་གསུངས་དང་། ད་ལྟར་ཡང་ནི་གསུངས་པ་དང་། མ་
འོངས་སངས་རྒྱས་ནམས་ཀྱིས་ཀྱང་། ཁི་བའི་རྒྱ་ནི་གསུངས་པ་ལྟེ། ཁ་བ་ཅན་རིའི་ནང་བྱང་བ། དེར་ནི་ཐམས་ཅད་འགྲུབ་པར་འགྱུར།

The border lands

Kā vi she, Bag ga la, O ḍi ya;
Ka che (Kashmir) and Sin dhu Land,
all the borders of the Kha ba can (Himalayas)
and in the north are Sthaviras
accomplishing the mantras of virtue,
which all the buddhas of the past said,
and all the buddhas of the present said,
and all the buddhas of the future said,
to be a cause of peace.
Arising in the mountains of Kha ba can,
there everything will be accomplished.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 2:10 AM
Title: Re: Prophecy of Buddhism's Downfall in India
Content:

Indrajala said:

I found this interesting: On one of his missions to Middle India, the Tang diplomat Wang Xuance is reported to have learned from the abbot of Mahābodhi Monastery about a belief among Indian clergy that when corrupt doctrines eventually eclipse the Indic lands, genuine Buddhist doctrines will continue to flourish in the peripheral east. In other words, after the disappearance of Buddhist doctrines from India, China would emerge as the new Buddhist realm. If this is indeed a true reflection of views of the seventh-century Indian clergy and not a fabrication of the Chinese Buddhists, it would not only explain the attempts by some of the South and Central Asian monks to authenticate the presence of bodhisattva Mañjuśrī at Mount Wutai, but also the increasing number of Indian and foreign monks making pilgrimage to China.

Tansen Sen, Buddhism Diplomacy and Trade The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600-1400 (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003), 84-85.

Does anyone know of anything similar with respect to Buddhism being transmitted into Tibet?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are similar predictions, for example in the Manjushri Root Tantra, if memory serves me correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 18th, 2013 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Materialism is nihilism, nihilism is against what the Buddha taught, and materialism doesn't lead to the cessation of suffering or nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

Ucchedavada, often mistranslated as nihilism, is the view that there is a self which perishes at death. But I am quite sure that is not Batchelor's view at all.

Vidyaraja said:

Neither the Buddha himself, nor all the Buddhist masters of the past, nor any Buddhist worth their salt today would call Batchelor a Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Batchelor practices that portion of Buddhadharma that he can accept. That makes him a follower of Buddhadharma whether you like it or not. He accepts that all conditioned phenomena are impermanent, that all afflicted phenomena are suffering, and that all phenomena lack self. He probably also accepts that nirvana is peaceful. In other words,

I am quite certain he accepts the four seals. Among the four seals there is not one word that mentions rebirth. He takes refuge in the Buddha, Dharma and Sangha.

I am quite certain that Buddha, being kinder than you, would find room for Batchelor among his students.

He just has problems with literal rebirth because he is a physicalist, just as you are a substance dualist. From my point of view, you are both wrong.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Actually, I've discussed this with others, but I think Buddhist monks/nuns in the west will have to learn from past examples and see to their own income. If it means producing cheese or honey on a communal farm arrangement, then so be it.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, so you have a group of people, who decide to wear special colored clothing, and adhere to a moral code and make stuff together. Not the Sangha I imagine Shakyamuni had in mind. But it is ok AFAIC. Chinese travelers reported (with some attitude) of the existence of married Mahāyāna "monks" who farmed for a living in India.

The point I was making above is that temples were positive contributors to the Tibetan economy. That is why the temple system functioned in Tibet (leave aside of course that Lang Darma was assassinated for deciding to tax Tibetan monasteries during the Asian economic crisis of the 840's -- that was a powerful message to Tibetan aristocrats by the newly powerful monastic establishment).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

We are still at a stage where for philosophical topics we are better off relying on Tibetan Geshes (or Western Geshes, but we produce so few).

Malcolm wrote:

This might be true if you are only interested in a very narrow scope of Gelugpa studies.

JKhedrup said:

I don't think my BA, even though it is from a good university, takes me even close to the level of scholarship required of a Geshe lharampa. A PhD might.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference between our system of education and the Tibetan system is that we are trained to self-educate. Tibetans were not. Curiosity is largely discouraged.

Degrees are not a measure of education. Literacy is. The education gap between the average Tibetan and a Geshe, or a Khenpo is huge. The education gap between a Geshe/Khenpo and your average college educated westerner is not so large.

Also, the useful aspect of Buddhism, what is actually needed for liberation is not found in the realms of polemical yig cha that Geshes and Khenpos specialize in. For most people, studying the niceties of the differences in opinion between scholars of dead Indian Buddhist traditions is just not that important. It is a great thing to do, but most people in the West are really not that interested in it.

JKhedrup said:

This term yogi has always confused me. If Yogi indicates some sort of level of attainment, I would say only a few would be worthy of that title. If it just means a lay practitioner, I guess it makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:

A yogi is someone who practices yoga i.e. tries to discover their real state through various means. Most Westerners actively engaged in Buddhism and Buddhist studies are yogis i.e. they practice Zen, Vipassana, Creation Stage yogas, Completion Stage yogas, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I can think of a lot of easier ways to grab at power rather than donning the robes.

Malcolm wrote:

Its the only way a non-aristocrat who is not a tulku can rise up in Tibetan society, apart from being merchant.

Ecclesiastical hierarchies often balanced and off-set the power of aristocratic hierarchies. but this phenomena does not exist in the West anymore.

Really, what I am pointing out here is that people need to intelligently about what the social implications of a monastic Sangha is in the west, Who is it for, how is it being paid for. While it is easy to understand why ethnic Buddhists such as Cambodians and so on have an interest in having a Vihara in their neighborhood, my experience tells me that second and third generation Asians in the USA are not really that interested in the religion of their forbears.

The point I am making is that in Tibet, for example, Monasteries served a valuable social role; they stored grain, they provided medical services, education and so on. The role they played in Tibet for example was a vital one. But what are monasteries going to do for people here? Evangelize so they can sell their services to a client population that does not really believe in the power of prayer(or if they do, they are probably already Christian).

I personally believe that people are in this headspace of thinking "What are we supposed to do for monastics", but I rarely see anyone asking the question "What real value will supporting a monastic population do for Western Buddhists (who are generally yogis)?" Yes, there is the merit argument, but frankly, this is rather weak.

The monastic sangha is facing a crisis of relevance in western countries. We are already, many of us, just as well educated as any Geshe (with different skill sets of course), and often more so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

jeeprs said:

I had always assumed that the monastic vocation...

Malcolm wrote:

Is actually very political. When you are not in it for sex, power becomes a primary pursuit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Lindama said:

The awakened ones are carefree in such matters.

Malcolm wrote:

That is just another story.

The point here is that we need to be aware of the fact that we are following narratives, preferring one narrative to another. There is not much meaning to the term "awakened one" if there is no narrative connected with their awakening. This is why there are compelling narratives around the liberations of Shakyamuni, Padmasambhava, Tonpa Shenrab and so on.

If we prefer so-called "early Buddhism" to Mahāyāna, or vice versa, we are giving preference to one story over another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Indrajala said:

The śramaṇa culture was already well-developed.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and was systematically engaged in breaking all kinds of social taboos.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:41 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So did Shakyamuni -- like abandoning his family, living in charnel grounds, and so on, wearing dyed winding sheets, etc.

Indrajala said:

Not really. The śramaṇa culture was already well-developed. Many of the Buddha's disciples were already mendicant yogis before studying under him.

In any case, the point is that Vajrayāna seems to have responded with violence and taboo sexual practices to ongoing repression on the part of Brahmins. This was rather revolutionary given the long-standing nominal observance of non-violence and brahmacarya on the part of the Buddhist sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

Taboo sexual practices? Like having sex? With real people? Vajrayāna is just more practical, that's all. And in terms of violence, all Buddhists did in those days was appropriate the symbols of ritual violence and procedures that were well known in their culture.

What I think most people ignore is that prior to the rise of Vajrayāna, there was a huge Puranic revolution that popularized and made available many rites and rituals that previously have been the precinct only of ritual specialists i.e. Brahmins. Buddhists used these rites and symbols, even making arguments for why Buddhist homavidhi was more effective than that of traditional Brahmins. The fact is that Buddhist ritual specialists increasingly took business away from Brahmins. In the context of Indian culture, anyone sufficiently expert in the general lines of Vajrayāna ritual, derived from Brahmanic dinācarya anyway, could replace a Brahmanic priest. This was not true in the day of the Buddha. Buddhist rulers for example continued to rely on Brahmin priests for state functions, etc. It is only after the fall of the Gupta that we see the rise in Vajrayāna texts, and this corresponds to the breaking of traditional patron/priest relationships in Northern India, and the replacement of the old order with new Buddhist ritual experts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:28 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

anjali said:

"Founder" is colloquial usage. Shakyamuni Buddha turned the dharma wheel once again after the buddha-dharma was forgotten in this world. Some people wish to follow his life model as a monastic. And people have done so throughout the centuries. If Shakyamuni Buddha hadn't lived a monastic lifestyle and founded a monastic order, I doubt any of us would be discussing the prospects of Buddhist monasticism in the West.

Malcolm wrote:

It all depends on who you think really turns the wheel of dharma, i.e., nirmanakāya emanations or the sambhoghakāya.

anjali said:

Does it have to be either/or? Surely you would acknowledge the fundamental role of Shakyamuni Buddha in reestablishing the buddha-dharma in this world? I think most Buddhists would acknowledge Shakyamuni Buddha as the historical root teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni is a historical teacher, and for my tradition, one of thirteen quasi-historical nirmanakāya teachers of great importance. But while important, he is not the most important teacher in my tradition.

That distinction belongs to a character known as "Garab Dorje" who hailed from Oḍḍiyāna. He was not a monk, had no Sangha, and a very small number of successors. He may in fact be entirely a Tibetan fiction, but no matter. For me he is more important than Shakyamuni Buddha.

Even so, even more important than he is the primordial Buddha Samantabhadra, of

which he is but an emanation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:20 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your Buddhism is not his Buddhism, that is all you can say.

Vidyaraja said:

If his atheistic-materialism (nihilism) is Buddhism, anything can be Buddhism, thus rendering the appellation "Buddhism" a meaningless term.

Malcolm wrote:

He feels his story is squarely grounded in the Buddha's teachings. You feel yours is. You are both interested in liberation from suffering. All that separates the two of you is that you are substance dualist and he is a physicalist. Oh, and he will readily call you a Buddhist, but you deny him (as I have in the past) the same decency -- that's another difference.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 11:16 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Indrajala said:

Vajrayāna in India seems to have indeed incorporated otherwise taboo practices.

Malcolm wrote:

So did Shakyamuni -- like abandoning his family, living in charnel grounds, and so on, wearing dyed winding sheets, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

[Though I will still maintain my position that Stephen Batchelor's brand of secular-atheistic "Buddhism" isn't Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Your Buddhism is not his Buddhism, that is all you can say.

Vidyaraja said:

That said, what is the difference between the self-liberation of Dzogchen and renunciation or transformation? Are not Nyingma monks renunciants and do their practices not lead to transformation (even if that transformation is just awareness of our naturally, spontaneously present enlightened state which is always there?)

Malcolm wrote:

By definition, anyone who practices either Vajrayāna or Dzogchen has abandoned the path of renunciation as their path.

Vidyaraja said:

Also, what is the difference between the self-liberation of Dzogchen and the anupaya or "method-less method" or "means of no-means" of Trika/Kashmir Shaivism?

Malcolm wrote:

Very different stories.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, it is really pretty simple. All yogic paths in Indian religion and its offshoots, whether Buddhist, Jain or Hindu, whether in India or Tibet, or China, etc., accept one thing in common: in order to cease taking rebirth in samsara, one must deal somehow with the kleṣas that drive rebirth.

Vidyaraja said:

That is true, but their views on the means to this can be deeply variant.

Malcolm wrote:

That's the point -- enlightenment, awakening, is just a story. We all subscribe to different stories of awakening. Some people like to imagine that their story is more solid, more real, than the stories of others. Certainly I have been guilty of this.

Basically, the fact that there is a story of awakening at all is the essence of Dharma. What does not matter very much are the details, except to you, the practitioner. If you ask me what story of awakening I like, I will very swiftly tell you that I like the story of

awakening as it is presented in the teachings of self-liberation, Dzogchen. I like it more than the story of awakening presented in the path of renunciation or the path of transformation. I like it more than the story of awakening presented in Samkhya, Trika, Vedanta and so on. The vehicle of self-liberation is my preferred story. I can't convince you to accept my story of liberation anymore than I could have been convinced of it when I was committed to Buddhism as a religion by someone else. Likewise, I cannot convince any one here of any story about liberation they are not disposed to believe.

But the one thing we share is that we all subscribe to narrative about liberation otherwise we would not be here discussing these issues. And that is why there is no closed Canon in Buddhism, why there never can be.

Buddhists, like all other religionists, like to think that they are the only ones who have a true story. Among Buddhists, all assert their preferred story of liberation as the best, or most practical, or the only possible, or the most historically accurate, and so on.

We Dharma practitioners demonstrate our commitment to our preferred stories by the choices we make, and the practices we do. But in the end we are merely making a commitment to a narrative of liberation we have decided to accept. And that is completely subjective, personal and non-verifiable. No one's putative awakening is verifiable by any objective, empirical standard -- and in these conversations about liberation we all behave as if there were some objective criteria by which liberation can be measured. This is absurd. Every standard by which we can measure liberation and awakening is a complete and utterly arbitrary mental line drawn in space. All of our narratives of liberation come from space too, just like clouds billowing in the sky.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

anjali said:

I think when most people think of the Buddhist tradition they are thinking of the Buddhism with Shakyamuni Buddha as the founder.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma has no founder. It has no historical origin. That is what you discover when you read Buddhist sūtras carefully, even the so called "early" ones.

anjali said:

"Founder" is colloquial usage. Shakyamuni Buddha turned the dharma wheel once again after the buddha-dharma was forgotten in this world. Some people wish to follow his life model as a monastic. And people have done so throughout the centuries. If Shakyamuni Buddha hadn't lived a monastic lifestyle and founded a monastic order, I doubt any of us would be discussing the prospects of Buddhist monasticism in the West.

Malcolm wrote:

It all depends on who you think really turns the wheel of dharma, i.e., nirmanakāya emanations or the sambhoghakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Who has the correct view?

Malcolm wrote:

The one who is has woken up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

anjali said:

I think when most people think of the Buddhist tradition they are thinking of the Buddhism with Shakyamuni Buddha as the founder.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma has no founder. It has no historical origin. That is what you discover when you read Buddhist sūtras carefully, even the so called "early" ones.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

anjali said:

Since the Buddha was a monk

Malcolm wrote:

There have been a lot of Buddhas, not all of them were monks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Whose enlightenment are you going to accept?

Still working on that one- slowly, slowly. There are such divergent opinions and paths. If

one accepts in a general way skillful means perhaps one can accept there are different paths for different practitioners. But of course the more zealous practitioners of the various systems often claim that their methods are unique in offering the full attainment of enlightenment, which leads to all our wrangling.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, it is really pretty simple. All yogic paths in Indian religion and its offshoots, whether Buddhist, Jain or Hindu, whether in India or Tibet, or China, etc., accept one thing in common: in order to cease taking rebirth in samsara, one must deal somehow with the kleśas that drive rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Thanks- so it would seem that Secularism could be said to be the dominant force in Scandinavia?

This is interesting.

Malcolm wrote:

Its the dominant force in America too, in the Blue States at any rate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

As it mentions, though, it is the Evangelical branches of Protestantism that are growing, so as I stated above people conditioned by those schools of religion are very unlikely to be interested in Buddhism anyways.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all besides the point.

The real point of your question is "Are monastics necessary for the continued transmission of Dharma in the West". I think not. It does not mean I am against people taking robes, though in the end it often proves to have been a bad decision.

There is no state support for monastics in the west. This has always served as the precondition for the success of the monastic Sangha. And it still is the condition which

supports the the Tibetan monastic establishment. In fact, the only good argument for maintaing the TGIE is that it supports the monasteries in India (otherwise, it will never regain Tibet so is sort of an anachronism). Without it, I think many Tibetan monasteries in India would disappear.

The shifting fortunes of Chinese monasticism has also been tied to the state, even in modern Taiwan.

in the end, the West is a howling wilderness still for Buddhist monasticism. And given that we live in a very degenerate era, I do not think it will be relevant or able to respond to the needs of westerners in the long term.

Still, you can try.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Put your money where your mouth is

Actually KD has extended assistance to Western monastics.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is good. I like a man who carries through on his stated convictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

One may judge incorrectly. The reality is, either Nichiren's claims are true or they aren't, they aren't true for some and false for others. Either enlightenment is real or it isn't.

Either Buddhist praxis is efficacious or it isn't.

Malcolm wrote:

Whose Buddhist praxis? Maybe Enlightenment is a total fantasy. Whose enlightenment are you going to accept? That one represented in the Pali Canon, Prajñāpāramitā? Chan? Zen? Pure Land? Nichiren? Dzogchen?

All of these schools have very different ideas concerning the path and the result. Whose is correct?

Again, it comes down to using one's own judgement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

seeker242 said:

Western monks and nuns are an intrinsic part of the 3rd jewel of the 3 jewels! Sangha is called 3rd Jewel for a reason! A Sangha with no renunciates? What kind of sangha is that?! A one that is lacking IMO! I wish there were many more monks/nuns in the west!

Malcolm wrote:

Sangha means all practitioners/or alternatively only realized practitioners (this is the actual Sangha Jewel ".

It has nothing to do with the color of ones clothes or the length of ones hair.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There are huge Roman Catholic communities in the US, Canada

Malcolm wrote:

Do you have any idea how much real estate the Vatican has for sale in the US? Or how much in decline the Catholic Church is in the US:

Pope Benedict XVI, who announced Monday that he is stepping down from the papacy, has led the Roman Catholic Church during a time of turmoil and change for American Catholics. Nearly one-third of Americans who were raised Catholic no longer describe themselves as Catholics. Overall, American Catholic churches lost 5 percent of their membership during the last decade, and the decline would have been much steeper if not for the offsetting impact of Catholic immigrants from Latin America.

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/pope-benedict-and-the-decline-of-american-catholicism-20130211>

Karma Dorje said:

Why would we want to discourage monasticism when there are practitioners that aspire to such conduct?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, step up and start funding Lama Tsewang out in Vancouver. Put your money where your mouth is. That is my challenge to all you advocates of monasticism in the west. If you want a monastic Sangha in the West, then pay for it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

.

Protestantism of the mainline variety is on the decline in North America. I think its influence is generally overstated. Protestantism of the charismatic/evangelical variety's influence is not so important as those shaped by it have little chance of developing interest in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

You completely missed my point -- as Latinos become americanized, they will also become Protestantized, and if they pick up yoga, Aryanized as well. It is not a religious thing, it is a cultural thing. And you might be surprised to learn this, but in Latin America, Protestantism is the fastest rising form of Christianity:

Home to about eight per cent of the world's 1.2 billion Catholics - more of the faithful than any country outside Brazil - Mexico has seen a slow but steady decline in people who self-identify with the faith. Currently about 82.7 per cent of Mexicans consider themselves Catholic, down from 88 per cent in 2000 and 96 per cent in 1970.

Evangelical protestant denominations are believed responsible for much of the drop.

"The Vatican is extremely concerned about competition with evangelicals," Daniel Levine, a professor at the University of Michigan who studies religious movements in Latin America, told Al Jazeera. "They are worried about losing their position as 'the' spokesperson for religion and morality in the region. It is a big change from a generation ago."

<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2012/03/201232593459332334.html>

In any event, in the US and in Northern Europe, you absorb the cultural morays if you want to get ahead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For those people who follow Nichiren it is true, for those of us who don't it is not.

Vidyaraja said:

So truth is relative and there is no absolute truth? It seems to me that either Nichiren's claims are true or they aren't.

Malcolm wrote:

Slippery slope there. All one is left with is one's own judgment about what to accept and reject.

Vidyaraja said:

If I revealed a new form of Buddhism wherein violence, theft, lying, and hedonistic indulgence is the path for our advanced Dharma-ending age and millions followed me, would it make that correct or worthy of being considered a form of Buddhism? I'd say no since it contradicts what the Buddha and preceding forms of Buddhism have upheld. There has to be some standard.

Malcolm wrote:

It is interesting to note that in the polemics against Bon, all kinds of standards that are raised and then abandoned when Bon meets them. In the end, Buddhists were just saying "Bon is not Buddhism because we say so".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Monastics provide a field of merit for lay people who do not want to immerse themselves in the practice to practice generosity. Their conduct and example can inspire. A diversity of paths benefits the greatest number of beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Most people in the west who do not practice, are also not Buddhists, so they do not care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Well it depends. I mean, if one trains as a translator, of teachings or texts, can contribute to the running of the centre, becomes a qualified teacher, or serves the lay community, there can be very great benefit.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't need monks or nuns for this. I cannot see at all any valid reason why supporting an ordained person is better than supporting a lay person in the same role. I mean, it is not like westerners are running to monasteries to have rites recited to

improve harvests, prevent frosts, etc. The context of supporting monastics to generate merit is lacking. This works in India because Indians in general support sadhus and other kinds of renunciates. It is a part of their culture. America and Northern Europe, the dominate places where there is interest outside of Asia in Buddhism are also Protestant countries. We don't like celibate priests much; we do not trust them culturally, and regard them with suspicion. And especially in Tibetan Buddhism there is a strong tradition of a trained laity who can carry out all the necessary religious roles which may be needed.

Quite frankly, most Buddhist learning is anachronistic -- the study of Abhidharma is great, but is deeply hampered by the medieval India culture that engendered it. The Prajñāparamita tradition is equally obscure and hard to make relevant. Even Madhyamaka is not so useful to most folks. "Why should I support this guy in studying such weird stuff that is not at all relevant to me?" -- this is the question that the monastic establishment must answer in the West.

There are basically four forms of Buddhism spreading in the West:

- 1) Psychological & Secular Buddhism ala Batchelor, etc.
- 2) Technological Buddhism i.e. Vajrayāna, Bon, Dzogchen etc.
- 3) Contemplative Buddhism i.e. Vipassana, Zen, etc.
- 4) Evangelical Buddhism i.e. Nichirin, Pure Land, etc.

While there are various crossovers between these four, none of these requires the basis of a monastic Sangha.

JKhedrup said:

2) People are meeting a lot of Western monks and nuns who are not qualified or behave badly, but if the standards improved they might be interested in assisting sincere practitioners who have an affinity for the path of ordination.

Malcolm wrote:

Western Buddhists who supports monastics in Asia general do so because of the "cute" factor, or because they have a personal connection with a monastery or a monastic. But it possible because it is cheap.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

If that is the case, how are we to discern which form of continual revelation is true?

Nichiren claims that only the Lotus sutra and the chanting of Daimoku can lead to liberation in this degenerate age of the Dharma. If his revelation is true, this invalidates

most other forms of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

For those people who follow Nichiren it is true, for those of us who don't it is not.

Vidyaraja said:

What about Stephen Batchelor's Buddhism devoid of all higher spirituality and regulated to the level of secular Buddhism? Can we say that this is also part of the continual revelation?

Malcolm wrote:

It is part of the history of Buddhism. His books have "entered the canon" so to speak as there are a large number of people who take them very seriously.

Vidyaraja said:

As to Sanderson's theories, I would say they are correct. The imagery in tantra, such as garlands of skulls or deities standing upon lesser deities or third eyes open, are absent from the Buddhism prior to Vajrayana but present within Shaivism. Hatha yoga, kundalini, occult corporeality (like chakras) are also absent from Buddhism prior to Vajrayana but also present within Shaivism. Mahakala for example, a deity absent from prior forms of Buddhism, is Bhairava, the wrathful form of Shiva. I personally respect a good deal of Shaivism, so this isn't a problem for me, but it may be for other Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, the first text to mention cakras is the Hevajra tantra -- even though the idea of nadis is very ancient. The notion of prāṇayāma and pratyahara, etc. are found in the Majjhima Nikaya and so on.

You need to read Davidson's book, he addresses the majority of your concerns quite well.

In this respect, there is a pan-Indian yogic culture, a toolbox of realization if you will, used by all schools who have different understandings of the results of that practice.

Buddha did not reject yoga, for example, he was a yogi. There is very little difference between how practice is described in the Yoga Sutras and what is described in Pali Buddhist scriptures. Though many people imagine that Patañjali was responding to Buddhists, I think this is a naive assumption.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: What do you really think of Western monks and nuns?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

The most neurotic Buddhists I have ever met were monks and nuns.

For true monasticism, where monks and nuns can practice single pointedly, some

confidence and support from the lay community is required.

Malcolm wrote:

And of what benefit is this to us? Why is having a monastic sangha a desiderata?

JKhedrup said:

We cannot simply pretend that there is not a problem if we ever hope to get this way of life going here.

Malcolm wrote:

Give a good reason why supporting Western monks and nuns benefits lay people in the West?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares? "Early" Buddhism is not the standard of what Buddhadharma is. "Early Buddhism" is a pedantic reconstruction.

Indrajala said:

The Dharma of the Buddha stems from the figure himself, who is best represented in reconstructions of "Early Buddhism", at least if you accept the mainstream ontology of the present day.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so. "Early" or "Original" Buddhism is text-"critically" engendered fantasy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Do you say early Buddhism is not the standard of what Buddhadharma is and that attempting to discern earliest Buddhism is a pedantic reconstruction because you sincerely believe that

Malcolm wrote:

Because I believe that is it merely a pedantic reconstruction.

Vidyaraja said:

I don't have anything against it for this reason, but it seems to me that the tantra of

Vajrayana is derived from Shaivist rather than Buddhist sources as Alexis Sanderson points out in this article:

Malcolm wrote:

Ronald Davidson has pointed out several shortcomings of Sanderson's theories in Indian Esoteric Buddhism.

I like what Dan Martin says, when defending Bon as a form a Buddhism:

"Eventually, and with the help of a very small band of Buddhologists who have been speaking rather too softly over the years, we will find out that Buddhism has always been a religion of continual revelation...the canonizers of Buddhist scriptures, if they were looking for integrity, would have done well to be satisfied with parts of one or two sūtras, much as our contemporary researchers for 'original Buddhism' would have us do. Then we today would be in a much better position, since ninety-nine percent of the Buddhist scriptures could be relegated to that great and greatly ignored category of 'apocrypha', could be safely dispensed with, just as the Bon canon as a whole has itself been pre-dispensed with."

Ppg 211-213 Unearthing Bon Treasures, Brill, 2001.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

I'm no arhat, but I see the wisdom in abandoning the immediate causes for suffering and anxiety. The politics and alternative universes you see in various forms of Buddhism are causes for causes for anxiety.

Malcolm wrote:

The immediate cause for suffering and anxiety is the three afflictions. There are three ways to deal with these: renunciation, transformation or self-liberation.

The latter two require instruction by a qualified guru. The former does not. In my estimation, the latter two are more effective in this day and age, as we have already discussed elsewhere.

The most neurotic Buddhists I have ever met were monks and nuns.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Early Buddhism and Mahayana

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Well the discussion as turned into general Mahayana, but my initial question was wondering which of the present forms would be most recognizable to the earliest

disciples of Buddhism and which would be most alien--be it in doctrine, modes of practice, approach, etc. I suppose what is meant by early Buddhism would be Buddhism during the first few centuries of its existence.

Indrajala said:

I think Pure Land Buddhism would be seen as rather alien to the early Buddhists, especially Shinran's ideas.

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares? "Early" Buddhism is not the standard of what Buddhadharma is. "Early Buddhism" is a pedantic reconstruction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize, that if you continue in this vein, whether intentionally or not, you are lending credence to the perception that you have animosity and bias towards Tibetan Buddhism.

Indrajala said:

I'm equally critical of any other form of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are not, not at all. You may feel you are, but I don't see you spending much time in the Chan/Zen and Pure Land Forums, or the Nicherin Forums criticizing them. Or the Theravada forums, for that matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

Strictly speaking, liberation from suffering is not the same as buddhahood. The point of Vajrayana is rapid progress to buddhahood.

dzogchungpa said:

What do you think the swiftest path to liberation from suffering is?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, its obvious by his choices. He thinks that being a renunciate is the fastest to achieve

liberation from suffering, and all of his comments in this vein are stemming from his conviction in this perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

The point is that if you make grand claims about advanced abilities and rapid spiritual development, then your tradition and members should readily display many good qualities and constant benevolent conduct.

Malcolm wrote:

Then at the very best, I think Vajrayāna fares quite well in that regard. At the very least, they are no worse than any other tradition within Buddhism.

You do realize, that if you continue in this vein, whether intentionally or not, you are lending credence to the perception that you have animosity and bias towards Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 17th, 2013 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

In other words, the burden of proof is on the people making such enormous claims.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so when are you going to start attacking the Buddha? After all, he made the grandest unsubstantiated claim of all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 16th, 2013 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

kirtu said:

Now in fact your guru may not be a perfect guru. Even Jamgon Kongtrul said that "nowadays perfect gurus are rare." So it may behoove people to read his comments in Ethics on the student/teacher relationship. This has apparently also been published under the title "The Teacher-Student Relationship" by Jamgon Kongtrul.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds like we are dealing with a not-even-marginally-adequate-in-terms-of-qualities guru here. And the implication of your post could lead one to believe that you disapprove separating oneself from a guru of questionable merits.

Actually, it is really, really easy to learn how to construct a mandala, read a liturgy, perform some mudras, ring a bell, wave a vajra around in the air and play a damaru, etc. Along with that, dress up in some traditional robes, look Tibetan, and walla, now you are a Guru.

The hard part about being a guru is guiding people along the path of Buddhahood when you yourself are not a Buddha — and that is where the pitfalls and dangers lay. Guiding people without conditioning them, helping them to understand and then open up their innate capacity for awakening is not easy. Frankly most so called "gurus" these days are just marketing religion in the name of awakening.

Anyone can learn a ritual or two. Waking up is a different matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 16th, 2013 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: is empowerment necessary for guru rinpoche guru yoga

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

i noticed that there are some webcasts but i dont know where, can you post the link.

malcolm, is this lung thing a bit dogmatic, since the lung transfers the lamas realization, or the seed of that. but isnt it kind of harsh that you can't do any practice without the lung for it. because not everyone has the possibility to receive lungs from lamas, but i dont think its a rule or a law that they cant because the dont have lung practice the dharma.

i have no idea when it is possible to receive lung for padmasambhava guru yoga. i dont even know if in the drikung lineage there is padmasambhava guru yoga. ive seen few on the internet and want to try them to see if my devotion flows more freely to padmasambhava than to jigten sumgön.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in Drikung there is the three roots practice of Yangzab as well as the terma cycles of Nuden Dorje. You can get the transmission for Padmasambhava Guru yoga quite easily in drikung.

You can in the meantime supplicate Padmasambhava by reciting the seven line prayer, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 16th, 2013 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Indrajala said:

This is of course different from the Vajrayana model, but it aims for buddhahood, which is separate discussion. Let's first get to liberation from suffering first before proceeding to more lofty goals.

Malcolm wrote:

Unless of course one is interested in Vajrayana right from the start...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 16th, 2013 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: is empowerment necessary for guru rinpoche guru yoga

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

i belong mainly to the lineage of drikung kagyu and i havent received the lung or the wang for ngondro but maybe next time i see rinpoche he will bless me with them.

anyway concerning padmasambhava guru yoga, id rather do guru yoga to padmasambhava than jigten sumgon. so is it allowed to practice padmasambhava guru yoga without initiation

Malcolm wrote:

Not without the lung.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: is empowerment necessary for guru rinpoche guru yoga

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

thats my question. is empowerment and lung necessary for padmasambhava guru yoga's.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Who holds the highest throne?

Content:

Alfredo said:
Thus spake Wikipedia:

Malcolm wrote:
This applies only in Gelug.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 10:05 PM
Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher
Content:
Indrajala said:
The real refuge is the Dharma, because it liberates and technically infallible.
.

Malcolm wrote:
The real refuge is the Dharmakāya, because unlike the Dharma and the Sangha, it is not impermanent.

That aside; as you know, the guru considered the primary refuge in Vajrayāna because that is the person from whom one receives both the ripening empowerments, and more importantly, the liberating instructions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 9:59 PM
Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher
Content:
Indrajala said:
I'm aware folks from Tibetan Buddhism will tend to disagree with this, but then I see how disappointed Tibetan Buddhists can be with their gurus. Some spend years and years with someone only to be emotionally and spiritually devastated.

Malcolm wrote:
Hence the detailed and pointed instructions in Vajrayāna texts about taking extreme care in choosing one's guru; the kind of guru to avoid, and the pitfalls of picking a bad one.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 9:57 PM
Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher
Content:
Indrajala said:
Place faith in the Dharma, not fallible humans.

Be your own teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

That attitude does not work in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 15th, 2013 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Nicholas Liber said:

Dowman, on the other hand, in his effort to overcome this obstacle, he's been making use of a more free rendering that includes poetic attitude as a means

Malcolm wrote:

Sadly, and this is a huge misunderstanding of Dzogchen texts i.e. that they are poetry. They are not. To the extent that they are in verses is merely an artifact of what we term "didactic verse". It is a good thing Dzogchen texts are not poetry, because were they so, they would be completely impossible to translate in any meaningful way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Andreas said:

You should read them carefully and maybe compare it with other existing translation to form a good opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

I base my opinions on the original Tibetan, not on comparisons with other English translations. Thus far, we are not there yet in terms of universally good translations of Dzogchen texts into English by anyone -- this includes my own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Andreas said:

Look at his many translations which had been published in the last years, works from Longchenpa and Vairocana: Eye of the Storm, Vairotsana's Five Original Transmissions

Malcolm wrote:
Already done by Adriano Clemente.

Andreas said:
Maya Yoga: Longchenpa's Finding Comfort and Ease in Enchantment

Malcolm wrote:
Guenther

Andreas said:
Natural Perfection: Longchenpa's Radical Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:
Barron

Andreas said:
Spaciousness: The Radical Dzogchen of the Vajra Heart, Longchenpa's Precious Treasury of the Dharmadhatu
and also :

Malcolm wrote:
Barron and Waldo

Andreas said:
Great Secret of Mind: Special Instructions on the Nonduality of Dzogchen
By: Tulku Pema Rigtsal, translated by Keith Dowman

Malcolm wrote:
Ok, my bad, this is the first original text, never before appearing in English, that he has translated and presented in many years.

Just to be clear, I am not saying that Dowman's translations are better or worse than these earlier ones I have listed. Merely that his follows theirs.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 9:37 PM
Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:
philji said:

Pema. Hi..sorry once again for any offence..these online forum things do have their drawbacks... I agree with what you say about people viewing Dzogchen as super sexy etc..... I am just a beginner myself but after receiving instructions from different teachers I can

now begin to see that the instructions for recognising nature of mind are contained in many , many teachings..maybe LL of them?.. Once you know where to look you see it everywhere..it's quite amazing.... I think some folks including myself view some teachings as inferior That's a shame..... Even taking refuge is an introduction to our mind essence is it not?

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Phil:

Dzogchen is not, as is commonly assumed, merely a teaching about the nature of the mind. It is, by itself, a separate vehicle and path to liberation, complete and independent from beginning to end.

Can it be approached gradually, via lower vehicles. Sort of. But it is possible, and in my opinion best, to practice Dzogchen by itself as a complete path. It is not a path for superior people, it is a superior path for inferior people.

Does Dzogchen have some common features with lower yanas such as refuge, and so on. Of course. But it is different in how it approaches such things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

dude said:

Let's move forward as "good friends," neither master nor disciple, but fellow practioners in mutual support to seek the correct path.

Malcolm wrote:

This attitude does not really work in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Vajrapine said:

In Vajrayana, there is so much emphasis on the guru, Samaya etc. So on top of that feeling of... betrayal I guess?... you have to wrestle with the fear of having initiated a Tantric process and relationship that might be toxic in some sense.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't care what traditional teachers might say. If you find you are in a relationship with

an unqualified teacher, drop them like a hot potato, don't look back, and if you are still interested in Dharma, then find another teacher. There are many teachers out there, good ones.

If a teacher has broken his own samayas, then you must not stay with that teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

miranda said:

Of course yes there is animal fat in the 3 white, but the fat used in sur is another one, which is not from milked products, and not ok for the riwo sang chö.

There is another point which is not clear for me: The musk is present in regular high grade tibetan incense. And some riwo sang chö texts (at least the Dudjom version of Lhatsun Namkha Jigme's) include nagas among the guests. Meanwhile I never was told not to use those incense sticks in the sang....

heart said:

Yes, I wonder about this also. The riwo sangchö sticks I use smells great and contains musk.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

If you have doubts, just use juniper...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

philji said:

I am sorry if I have offended anyone through my mention of greediness for Dzogchen...I uses I am old Skool and feel the need for purification and accumulation to clear the shit away from my eyes... Having received the introduction to the nature of my mind this accumulation and purification is so much more wonderful....

Malcolm wrote:

If you feel you need purification, etc., great. But you should not extrapolate from your condition to the condition of others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

so am i correct that you register in your local dzogchen community that is lead by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and then you have the acces the the archive of webcasts?

Malcolm wrote:

The way it works is like this. You can listen to any open webcast (most webcasts are open) without being a member at all.

If you want to listen to replays, then there is an archive of those online, but you must be a member of the Dzogchen Community to access them and must have a password., etc.

You cannot receive any sort of transmission from a replay, they are intended to help people remember what rinpoche taught.

IN order to receive any transmission, you must be listening live. In your case, your gar is Merigar West. So you purchase your membership through their website.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

i dont think dzogchen outrules mahayana teachings of loving kindness and compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen reveals the fact that compassion is a natural expression of the primordial state. Discover that, and you will discover true compassion. Otherwise, compassion is very partial and selective -- I see this among so called "Mahāyāna" practitioners all the time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 13th, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

philji said:

Everyone is so greedy for Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

Is there a problem with wanting to receive Dzogchen teachings right away? Is there a problem with wanting to be introduced to one's primordial state directly? I should think

not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

ive read a little bit from his website.

it is still quite unclear if it is possible for me to attend these webcasts.

Malcolm wrote:

Many webcasts are open. You can attend by clicking the following link.

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/>

He always gives the complete transmission of Dzogchen in every retreat (some people may disagree, but they are wrong).

So you tomorrow morning, receive some lungs etc., and then make sure you attend the next webcast retreat which is open. In the meantime, you join Dzogchen Community so you can buy restricted books, and receive a password to listen to replays of retreats.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen

Content:

KonchokZoepa said:

can you be an ordinary semi beginner Dharma practitioner and still receive the direct introduction?

thankyouu

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, just attend the open webcasts by ChNN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Getting back on track after a failing teacher

Content:

Vajrapine said:

For some years I have followed a teacher in the Tibetan tradition, who simply put has failed.

It has been a very painful process to accept this, and in that process I have lost the drive to practice. It just dissipated. I don't mind practice in theory, but I seem to totally have lost the connection in practice.

I would be immensely grateful for any advice, especially from anyone who has been through a similar experience, on how to get back in the saddle.

VP

Malcolm wrote:
Find a teacher you respect.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 8:41 AM
Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen
Content:
KonchokZoepa said:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pointing-out_instruction

if this is what you mean, can you find direct introduction or pointing out introduction in / from books?

i dont have a mulaguru with whom i study regularly, although i just found out that there is a nyingma rinpoche living in my country, although in different city.

do the Nyingmapas teach dzogchen to the beginners?

and can you even study dzogchen successfully with books or is there a requirement for the teacher to introduce it ?

Malcolm wrote:
Just attend webcasts by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. That is the place to start.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 12th, 2013 at 5:26 AM
Title: Re: when to start studying and practicing Dzogchen
Content:
KonchokZoepa said:
im quite a beginner meditator, what are the requirements concerning meditation that you can integrate the dzogchen teachings in meditation?

Malcolm wrote:

Direct introduction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 11th, 2013 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Jikan said:

Interesting. Is he revising/updating the translations of others, or simply republishing them wholesale?

Malcolm wrote:

I can't say what his method is -- but he definitely seems to be retranslating texts others have forged ahead before him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 11th, 2013 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's translations

Content:

Jikan said:

I'd like to know what knowledgeable people think of Keith Dowman's translations (of which I have read only a few). It seems to me he has a unique approach to the work of translation, and there's no question he's productive.

Thoughts? Recommendations?

Malcolm wrote:

He has not published any original translations for many years. The majority of his published translations are retranslations of texts others have already translated. Rightly or wrongly, this has tarnished his reputation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 9th, 2013 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Thank you for your patience with this overly long post. Any insights and comments are most welcome and are always very helpful and interesting additions to a great discussion.

b.f.

Malcolm wrote:

Who knows? I know another person who claims they experienced rigpa by merely being

in Tulku Orgyen's presence without him even uttering a single word, before they have even received a single word of Dzogchen, and according to this person, when TU was asked about this experience later on, this person claims that TU confirmed that it indeed was rigpa this person experienced. This person is also not a person who is setting themselves up as a teacher, etc.

The only really important question a person should ask, and then only to themselves "Would I take teaching from this Mr. Bertelsen?" There are three answers, yes, no and "wait and see".

At this point I do not really see what the benefit to this continued discussion is. I certainly think that Mr. Bertelesen would prefer it if we not make him a continued subject of our scrutiny, because as far as I can tell, apart from naively sharing his experience in a book, he is harming no one that I can see. After all, this is just religion and people can believe whatever the hell they want. Some people believe that Trungpa was a horrible person, other people believe he was a saint, for example. The same is true of HHDL. In the end we are merely left with our own judgements and speculations and these judgements and speculations harm us much more than they harm their object.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 7th, 2013 at 8:57 AM
Title: Re: Celibacy
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Relax

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 7th, 2013 at 4:37 AM
Title: Re: Celibacy
Content:
Dronma said:
I don't like the expression "Boss" when we talk about Rinpoche.

dzogchungpa said:
I believe there is a scene in "My Reincarnation" where Yeshe Namkhai refers to Rinpoche as "the boss".

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, many of us refer to ChNN as "the boss" on a regular basis. He is our boss.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 7th, 2013 at 2:36 AM
Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Unknown said:

In Dzogchen, meditation experiences are not the natural state, if I have understood correctly; you are either having meditation experiences, or you are in the natural state.

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, one is to train in the recognition of the "natural state" while having experiences. Bliss, clarity and non-conceptuality are distinct experiences used for this purpose.

Both movement and stillness are the energy of vidyā.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 7th, 2013 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Goddess Marici and Mayajalamahatantra

Content:

Rakshasa said:

Anyone has any info about Mayajalamahatantra which is about Goddess Marici. I've heard that Goddess Marici is the goddess of military arts. Is this tantra found in Tibetan canon?

kirtu said:

I have to check my notes (and this notebook is not with me at eh moment) but I'm pretty sure that in Bari Lotsawa's cycle she appears as a bodhisattva guarding primarily against robbery.

Kirt

Konchog1 said:

Ah, I remember reading (somewhere) that she is a Kriya deity and often prayed to by travelers. The book didn't explain why she was prayed to though.

Malcolm wrote:

For protection against bandits.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Rinpoche is not talking about illusory body in this context. He really means that there are thirteen other planets where Dzogchen is present being taught.

duffster1 said:

Hi,so he IS saying Dzogchen is being practiced on other planets?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he is. Over and over again for years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

Adamantine said:

That said, Dzongsar Khyentse has said (in an online podcast you can check out) that you don't even strictly need any incense for Riwo Sang Cho, the visualization is enough if you can't do the physical offering-- at least that's what my memory says he said!)

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

And you do not even need to recite a lot of words, use a sang stuff, smudge stick, incense, and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

WeiHan said:

So all other substances are really just later addition?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

WeiHan said:

Hi Malcolm,

For a city dweller like me, life is hectic. Juniper or plants are not readily available. The best option is burning an incense stick for the daily sang practice. It is 100 times better than not practicing. I think different people have a different situation.

Malcolm wrote:

Incense is fine as long as it is pure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: ChNN's Yantra yoga: Transmission or no transmission?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Here it is made quite clear that anything within the following book (including the Tsadul Pranayama) can be practiced without Transmission:

Chögyal Namkhai Norbu said:

<http://www.yantrayoga.org/store3/books/tibetan-yoga-of-movement-the-art-and-practice-of-yantra-yoga/> presents what we call the Open Level of Yantra Yoga and covers the basic practice of Yantra that anyone can apply with a little training and good will. This is my intention and my hope in opening Yantra Yoga to the world.

Lhug-Pa said:

This also implies that the Four Profound Applications Breathing from the public DVD's (which doesn't even reach Minor Kumbhaka, but even so there must be some benefit from it otherwise it would have been pointless to include in the DVD's), since the public DVD's are of the Open Level of Yantra Yoga as explained above by Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

This book contains:

"Table of Contents:

What is Yantra Yoga?; The Uniqueness of Yantra Yoga; Advice for Practice; Warm-ups; The Nine Purification Breathings; The Five Exercises for Loosening the Joints; The Eight Movements to Purify the Prana; The Five Exercises to Control the Channels; The Five Main Groups of Yantras: The First Group; The Second Group; The Third Group; The Fourth Group; The Fifth Group; The Vajra Wave to Eliminate Obstacles"

As I said, all the yantras apart from the seven lotuses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 6th, 2013 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Anonymity and Trolling

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

This is a nonsense discourse for analyzing forums: anonymous people and their trolling.

Malcolm wrote:

A perfect example of trolling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

Dan74 said:

At the end of the day there's something a little suss about rubbishing someone else's religion and culture, even if the said rubbishing makes good points.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many cultural practices that are abusive of people -- these should be spoken out against. Customs where rapists have the option to marry their victims to expiate their crime. The binding of women's feet is another such custom. The custom of burning wives you wish to discard. The custom of honor killings. The custom "circumcising" the clitorises of young girls. The custom of denying young women to right to fair education. The custom of abducting young boys and training them as soldiers. I could go on. None of these customs are worthy of defending or ignoring. All of these customs have cultural and religious justifications. All of these customs are brutal indignities that defy basic principles of human decency.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

WeiHan said:

So all other substances are really just later addition?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Sherab Dorje"

Anyway, i was more referring to the precious metals and stones, sandalwood, silk material, etc.[/quote]

You don't need any of this for Sang offerings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

After all this discussion on suitable ingredients etc... I am going to be a party pooper and say that the thing that is of utmost importance is the internal and secret offering. Not that the external offering isn't important, but I find it hard to believe that yogis living in caves in remote areas of Tibet had access to all the necessary physical ingredients all the time, yet they practiced because they did have access to the most important ingredient: their mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Juniper grows everywhere in Tibet. Flour, honey and milk are available to everyone too.

Making sang substance is not a big deal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

uan said:

A theocracy is antithetical to our traditions...

Sherab Dorje said:

Really? What about Tibet before the Chinese invasion?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibet was never a theocracy. Wrong term. Tibet was not internally organized in this way. If any thing, Tibet was a loose confederation of small, independent Oligarchies, some ruled by monastic interests (who generally functioned much as corporations do today), others ruled by aristocratic families.

The Lhasa government was a combination of the two, the Khashag consisting of a board made up of an equal mix of secular aristocrats and monastic bureaucrats (who, like Desri Sangye Gyatso, were not always themselves monks). The Khashag had very little concrete power outside of the immediate precincts of Ü and Tshang.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Celibacy

Content:

Unknown said:

It is true that some of the books and DVDs about Yantra Yoga are in the public section of SSI webstore. However, it is necessary for someone to have received in advance, at least, the Guruyoga Transmission from Rinpoche, in order to practice the Pranayamas and the advanced Yantras. Only the preliminary practices are open to all. This I know from Laura Evangelisti during a Yantra Yoga course I followed personally.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, all the yantras can now be practiced as well as some of the pranayamas by people without having had transmission from the Boss.

What you say used to be the case, but that has now changed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 5th, 2013 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Or perhaps you are not communicating effectively and need to try another approach.

Sherab Dorje said:

I considered that. That's why I explained it slightly differently each time. Now, unfortunately I am limited to expressing myself with written words, so there is only so much I can do (poetry is not my forte)!

I could post photos of dead Muslim children from all over the world, but then I would be accused of being dramatic.

Do you have something else in mind? I'm willing to try it.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is that you are having one conversation, and Khendrup is having another. So in fact you are talking past each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 4th, 2013 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Anonymity and Trolling

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Somebody interested in intelligent and informed discussion will take the views of the other party into account too.

Malcolm wrote:

The commonly accepted definition of a troll is someone who disrupts conversations for sheer enjoyment.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Troll_%28Internet%29

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 4th, 2013 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I'm not repeating it four times because I want you to agree with me, I am doing it because clearly you (and others) are not understanding what I am trying to say.

Malcolm wrote:

Or perhaps you are not communicating effectively and need to try another approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 4th, 2013 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Rinpoche is not talking about illusory body in this context. He really means that there are thirteen other planets where Dzogchen is present being taught.

Nighthawk said:

In this solar system? Hmmm

Malcolm wrote:

No, not in this solar system, obviously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 3rd, 2013 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Definition of liberal: broad-minded; especially : not bound by authoritarianism, orthodoxy, or traditional forms

When this philosophy becomes selective, ignoring authoritarianism and traditional values that trample on the rights of others, I decided to refer to it as neo-liberalism. It is a selective application of liberal principles according to the modern laws of identity politics and political correctness, which leads to a peculiar silence that shrilly denounces human rights abuses by some and strategically ignores them by others.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, you can't use this — neo-liberalism already has a well defined meaning. It refers to the radical free market ideology that drives corporate globalization.

The far right in the states has coined a term that might exploit to advantage for such people that you describe: libtard.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 3rd, 2013 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Rinpoche is not talking about illusory body in this context. He really means that there are thirteen other planets where Dzogchen is present being taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 3rd, 2013 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Master Norbu may be referring to the illusory body.

Malcolm wrote:
No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 11:17 PM
Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit
Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:
Actually, there is major difference between Tibet and the Andes: water. Water was never in shortage in Tibet. A major river runs right through the center of the country fed by smaller rivers on both sides. Tibetan "urban" civilization was entirely clustered around rivers. Indeed, it is supposed that the Zhang Zhung civilization centered around Kailash collapsed because of climate change, pushing the Zhang Zhung tribes into lower part of the what is the modern day TAR where there was more water.

The Andes, by comparison, are really quite dry, so water is much more of an issue for the Incas.
I don't think you could generalize about the Andes like that, the altiplano sure, but even then there's the Apurimac river to the West of Cusco with the Urubamba flanking East also.

Malcolm wrote:
There is nothing in Andes that resembles the Tsangpo river.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 9:52 PM
Title: Re: Ajahn Sujato on hate speech re:Buddhists in Aus. mosque
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
This is all irrelevant to the Dharma. America is not a Dharma country (Dharmadeśa), Europe is not a Dharma country; though some buddhists might imagine it is a "central" country due to the presence of the few thousand monks.

What we have are squabbles between various worldly people and other various worldly people. Should they avoid violence? Yes.

American foreign policy has been aggressive for decades. Our Government is the Ajatasatru of the modern era.

Dar el Islam has been aggressive for centuries -- and American foreign policy has woken a sleeping behemoth. Of course there are Western educated liberal muslim scholars.

They are marginal in their own communities however. What they have to say is drowned in the rising tide of anger the Muslim world has towards the West.

The Buddha made things very clear. When a country is peaceful, minding its own business, caring for its population, then well, if they are attacked it is correct for them to respond. Do America and Europe fit this picture? No.

Therefore it should come as no surprise to us that some Moslems are attacking symbols of western imperialism since they do not yet have the power to attack us en masse directly.

The only sane response to this is for America and Europe to depart the middle east peacefully. If the whole place goes up in flames in the ensuing chaos, there is sadly nothing we can do except provide medical and humanitarian relief. But our experiments in regime changes have been utter failures so far.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 10:09 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

brendan said:

How can you type that but also claim there were social advancements in pre-PRC Tibetan civilisation equal to that of western civilisation who had no Realized Masters or Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing at all do with the whether there are more realized Tibetan masters in Tibet or India.

There are more realized Buddha masters (of Vajrayāna) with the borders of Tibet than without. I was not making any sort of claim about Indian civilization, Tibetan Civilization, Western Civilization and so on. You were the one who introduced this into the discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

JKhedrup said:

To be frank I am surprised you would quote such a source and give it so much credence.

Lotus_Bitch said:

There is some credence to what Indrajala brought up though. Looking at the Incan civilization, we see that they developed running water, baths, etc. within similar conditions (of the Tibetans) in the Andes mountains....

<http://enperublog.com/2009/07/08/surprising-water-engineering-at-machu-picchu/>

http://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g294314-d553950-Reviews-Inca_Baths_at_Tambomachay-Cusco_Cusco_Region.html

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, there is major difference between Tibet and the Andes: water. Water was never in shortage in Tibet. A major river runs right through the center of the country fed by smaller rivers on both sides. Tibetan "urban" civilization was entirely clustered around rivers. Indeed, it is supposed that the Zhang Zhung civilization centered around Kailash collapsed because of climate change, pushing the Zhang Zhung tribes into lower part of the what is the modern day TAR where there was more water.

The Andes, by comparison, are really quite dry, so water is much more of an issue for the Incas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

brendan said:

I understand western civilizations so called achievements are not a manifestation of "right view" and could be seen as being demonic.

Malcolm wrote:

You are making an idiot of yourself by such declarations.

brendan said:

Why? climate change seems to be a direct result of our progress.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no teaching in the Dharma that declares useful things "demonic" or somehow lacking "right view".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Humour isn't a sin. You should be able to laugh at Hyecho and his silly remark.

Malcolm wrote:

Humor is not a sin; bringing up that citation in the context this discussion shows an appalling lack of proportion.

Indrajala said:

Jeff, you need to study the history of Central Asia a little more carefully: it is certain that this monk's view of Tibetans was jaundiced by the fact that Tibetans (from Lhasa) held sovereignty over large swaths of Central Asia.

Sure, but the Tang history gives detailed observations of the Tibetan culture and habits at the time. Hyecho isn't my only source.

Malcolm wrote:

Consider the source: the Chinese have had nothing good to say about Tibetans since Minister Gar tricked the emperor out of his prized daughter.

Indrajala said:

Naw. I just counter the overzealous hype over Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Jeff -- your participation here was not countering any overzealous hype about Tibet. Anyone reading the thread can see this. What anyone can also see is that someone who claims to be Buddhist monk is casting racist aspersions about Tibetans, which they should not do, just as they should not invent and spread racist myths about Muslims -- which unfortunately happens in Tibet these days a lot. Tibetans happen to be very racist people in general. So when I hear racist things coming out of the mouths of Tibetans about westerners, or Muslims or Chinese people I become equally annoyed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are either finding yourself amusing, or you have vastly overestimated the caloric value of yak dung as fuel. Trust me, it does not burn very hot, and it takes a very, very long time to heat water at 13,000 feet.

Indrajala said:

When I was in Ladakh at 3600 metres above sea level I managed to do a quick cold wash sponge bath before getting my clothes quickly back on. Easy enough with a small amount of cold water.

Some descriptions of pre-modern Tibet just make it sound like they weren't trying, even in terms of basic sanitation in monasteries.

Malcolm wrote:

Descriptions of pre- Modern Canada makes it sound like they weren't trying very hard, even in terms of the basic sanitation of Toronto.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think this is funny?

Indrajala said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Many racists think their quips about the mores (whether true or false) of other people are funny. It's one of the signs by which one can tell one is racist towards a given group of people.

Indrajala said:

It is a little strange that he thinks there were no monasteries nor knowledge of Buddhism in Tibet. He clearly never visited Central Tibet in his travels.

The Tang Chinese didn't seem to think the Tibetans had much Buddhism, either. In the 8th century maybe they had a bit in the aristocratic circles.

Malcolm wrote:

Jeff, you need to study the history of Central Asia a little more carefully: it is certain that this monk's view of Tibetans was jaundiced by the fact that Tibetans (from Lhasa) held sovereignty over large swaths of Central Asia.

Indrajala said:

I think I've hit a sore spot. Some people here are rather emotionally invested in Tibet ... as Tibetan Buddhists?

Malcolm wrote:

No, if you are saying the same thing about blacks, Chinese people, mexicans, etc., I would equally take you to task.

You never spare any occasion to point barbs at Tibetans or their culture on this forum. Its pretty unbecoming conduct for a so called Buddhist monk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Not too long ago a Tibetan monk commented to me that he felt besides Buddhism, he thinks Tibet never really had much of a civilization.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure your monk friend never went to Tibet and has very little understanding of Tibetan culture and history, having spent his entire life in India (no wonder non-diaspora Tibetans find diaspora Tibetans annoying).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Indeed, if the Tibetans in the more remote and barren areas bathed regularly it would have become a threat to the environment- wood was that scarce and the trees would have disappeared.

Indrajala said:

Naw. An extra dung fire a day for washing wouldn't have been a big deal.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are either finding yourself amusing, or you have vastly overestimated the caloric value of yak dung as fuel. Trust me, it does not burn very hot, and it takes a very, very long time to heat water at 13,000 feet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just read the thread. It's ridiculous and you know it.

Indrajala said:

It is kind of comical, sure, but really my point is that the Tibetans invested a lot of resources into their religion (that's fine) while maybe neglecting things like hygiene, sanitation and infrastructure which they had examples from neighbouring cultures.

The Tang Chinese for instance had mile marker stones which facilitated travel and trade. They also had a limited pension system, baths and other such useful things. The Tibetans could have emulated such projects, but for various reasons it seems they didn't take so much of an interest. In the long-term they invested their resources differently, perhaps neglecting what could have been quite beneficial projects.

Malcolm wrote:

And just exactly what do you know about public works projects and Tibetan civilization? Given how sparsely populated the country was, it is amazing what Tibetans accomplished.

Indrajala said:

I'm well aware of the climate and water issues in Tibet. They still could have taken some of their resources and built public baths. They ultimately didn't. It wasn't a big deal ultimately.

Malcolm wrote:

You are being disingenuous.

Indrajala said:

So this conversation just strikes me as quite racist and narrow minded, with an absence of reflection on the real cultural circumstances, environmental and so on that, that we find these people in.

Was there a pressing need to munch on lice as Hyecho pointed out?

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think this is funny?

Do you have a pressing need to repeat the inaccurate observations of an eighth century Korean out of context?

It is a little strange that he thinks there were no monasteries nor knowledge of

Buddhism in Tibet. He clearly never visited Central Tibet in his travels.

It appears from his observation that he only passed through the nomadic region in far Western Tibet upon leaving Kashmir. So his observations must be considered rather suspect if one is to generalize from them as a whole.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

JKhedrup said:

So it seems unfair to target the Tibetans in this regard.

Malcolm wrote:

It is blatantly racist, given the way and the tone in which the subject was raised.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

brendan said:

I understand western civilizations so called achievements are not a manifestation of "right view" and could be seen as being demonic.

Malcolm wrote:

You are making an idiot of yourself by such declarations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Honestly, I never expected to see such racial prejudice on this forum.

I don't think you can convincingly argue that this is about race. More just poor quality sanitation and hygiene in a given civilization.

Malcolm wrote:

Just read the thread. It's ridiculous and you know it. It is not as if most people in Western Countries have had hot and cold running water prior to 1940.

The attitude being expressed here is one of total misunderstanding of a) differences in climate between the Himalayas and India; resources availability such as water -- it is not like they bathed with heated water in India, Jeff, they used water as it was from wells and rivers, heated by the sun. Rivers in Tibet are extremely cold even in the summer.

Tibetans made regular use of hot springs where they existed. But most nomads lived in places far away from such volcanically active sites, herding yaks and sheep in the meadows and plains.

In places like Lhasa, the aristocracy could afford more regular bathing, just like in Europe, whereas poorer people could not afford it. Monks, when they bathed, only bathed twice a month.

Just as in Americas during the 16th, 17th, 18th, and much of the 19th century, regular bathing was regarded as unhealthy by much of the Tibetan population, farmers and nomads. It was only after Pasteur that bathing began to take hold in Europe and the US. And daily bathing was not common in the US until after WWII, and in parts of Europe, it is still not common.

Conditions in India are different -- it is hot, people are much hairier -- Tibetans have virtually no body hair in general.

In terms of sewer systems -- Tibet never had large populations apart from in Lhasa to deal with, so it was not an issue for most Tibetans when they came to India and Nepal. Population pressure by the Chinese have forced a lot of Tibetans away from their previous, lowland winter habitations, further, most of the pollution in Tibet has been brought by the Chinese, who now outnumber Tibetans in their own land by quite a bit.

So this conversation just strikes me as quite racist and narrow minded, with an absence of reflection on the real cultural circumstances, environmental and so on that, that we find these people in.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

brendan said:

Washing is just one example.

What about woman and children?

What about medicine, giving practitioners safe infrastructure (sewage systems etc)..

Malcolm wrote:

You really actually have no clue what you are talking about. Your ignorance of Tibetan culture and history is pretty appalling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

They didn't see the bathing as worth maintaining it seems.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhist monks, according to Mula Sarvastivada Vinaya, were only permitted to bath twice a month.

Also the Tibetans understood quite well the germ theory of disease.

Honestly, I never expected to see such racial prejudice on this forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 31st, 2013 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you people have any clue how racist you sound right now?

Have you examined the hygienic habits of 19th century Canadians and Americans in comparison to the hygienic habits of 19th century Tibetans?

Do you seriously think we were actually cleaner than Tibetans prior to the time when most Europeans and Americans had no running water in their homes?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 10:46 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

anjali said:

are realized masters still present in Tibet who can give authentic transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

More than in India, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 10:45 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Sherlock said:

There are many Chinese monastics at Larung and Yachen and many books and commentaries are translated into Chinese that are not available in English. The accuracy of the translations is a different matter, but the content is out there and there is a demand for it.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chinese actually bulldozed major sections of Larung Gar because there were Chinese people there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Thank you malcolm, that is interesting, it does sound what I remember hearing. Don't know about past and future tense in the Tibetan language, if it is always obvious or not.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it is quite clear in the original text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

cool. great details, etc.

i also heard that there may be a listing of 64 Dzogchen Buddhas in their respective aeons and with their respective buddhafiels and world systems.

Malcolm wrote:

Temporally, it is not hard to discern. They are prior to this eon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

mutsum said:

This is clearly not the case. The meaning of thal-ba is given throughout the commentary as (reduced to) powder, etc. HE Khenpo Jigphun has a long explanation about it, directly related to the title.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I think you are over looking the meaning of thal ba as "samatikramatikrānta".

mutsum said:

Possibly though I doubt it. I prefer to stick to Vimalamitra's interpretation in the commentary and the long explanation by HE Khenpo Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

Is Khenpo Jigphun's explanation to be found in his collected works?.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

mutsum said:

This is clearly not the case. The meaning of thal-ba is given throughout the commentary as (reduced to) powder, etc. HE Khenpo Jigphun has a long explanation about it, directly related to the title.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I think you are over looking the meaning of thal ba as "samatikramatikrānta".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is referring to the so called "thal ba'i gnas", of which there are thirteen.

mutsum said:

No, you are mixing these sanctuaries (thal-ba'i gnas) and the pure realms or buddhafiels (zhing khrams). There are eight of these sanctuaries only, and thirteen pure realms. Actually pure realms (zhing khams) are a subdivision of these sanctuaries.

Malcolm wrote:

There are thirteen thal bas explained in the sgra thal gyur -- it is very clearly explained:

1. thal ba dbyangs
2. thal ba 'dzin
3. thal ba skyob
4. thal ba brdal ba
5. thal ba'i be con
6. thal ba'i rgyun
7. rab tu thal bas khyab
8. thal ba'i sgra
9. thal ba'i rlung
10. rin po che'i rlung thal ba
11. 'du ba'i thal ba
12. dung ldan thal ba
13. skar ma'i thal ba

Each one is called a buddhafiield, because each one also has a teacher, retinue, teaching, etc.

While the commentary on the text indeed glosses "thal ba" as brdal ba in this context i.e. "spread out", however, Norbu Rinpoche maintains that "thal ba" means "beyond".

What the text says is that there are eight types of thal ba'i gnas.

1. 'jig rten khams (durgatiloka)
2. shing khams (kṣetraloka, buddhafiields)
3. dam bca' skyobs
4. skyon gnas
5. 'pheb pa'i sa
6. sbyor ba
7. grags
8. song ba'i gnas

We are discussing here class two: buddhafiields where Dzogchen is taught.

Perhaps we are talking past each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche may be referring to the twelve Nirmanakaya Dzogchen Buddhas

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is referring to the so called "thal ba'i gnas", of which there are thirteen. thal ba

may mean "galaxy" or it may mean "universe". It is certainly broader than a solar system.

Within these thirteen thal ba are so called "fields" (kṣetras, zhing khams). The term zhing khams is often translated as "pure land", but that is inaccurate -- there are both pure and impure kṣetras. A better term is "buddhafield", since a kṣetra is defined as the field of activity of a given Buddha or bodhisattva. All of the zhing khams mentioned in these thirteen thal bas contain buddhas.

In these thirteen thal bas and their buddhafields it is maintained that Dzogchen teachings are presently found during this epoch.

Nighthawk said:

What is the criteria to get into these buddhafields?

Malcolm wrote:

One assumes merit, just the same as what got into this buddhafield.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quite the opposite -- Dharma in Tibet, while under siege, has experienced a massive intellectual resurgence, especially in Eastern Tibet, Amdo and Golok -- with thousands of books being published in Tibetan language every year on all subjects.

Indrajala said:

That rather undermines or at least takes away from the arguments of diaspora Tibetans who say Buddhism is being systematically crushed and eradicated from Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

I already mentioned that Tibetans in Tibet do not necessarily like Diaspora Tibetans very much.

For example, in Tibetan communities in this country [US] they tend to stay separate, with the Diaspora Tibetans always suspecting the non-Diaspora Tibetans of being spies.

There are also regional issues.

However, Institutional Buddhism is being suppressed when it represents a political threat to the Chinese, but the Chinese seem to care very little to prevent Tibetan Buddhist literary production as long as it is strictly academic and religious. Of course the non-diaspora Tibetans have developed an entire vocabulary for voicing their complaints to one another, but Beijing seems not to care. if you ever watched modern Tibetan dance music, you will see all kind of coded references to independence, HHDL

and so on.

Also when Chinese people become interested in teachers like Khenpo Jigme Phuntsok, the Chinese will step in to put it down. They don't seem to care if the Tibetans practice Buddhism -- but they are not happy when the Chinese become interested in it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen practiced on different solar systems?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche may be referring to the twelve Nirmanakaya Dzogchen Buddhas

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is referring to the so called "thal ba'i gnas", of which there are thirteen. thal ba may mean "galaxy" or it may mean "universe". It is certainly broader than a solar system.

Within these thirteen thal ba are so called "fields" (kṣetras, zhing khams). The term zhing khams is often translated as "pure land", but that is inaccurate -- there are both pure and impure kṣetras. A better term is "buddhafield", since a kṣetra is defined as the field of activity of a given Buddha or bodhisattva. All of the zhing khams mentioned in these thirteen thal bas contain buddhas.

In these thirteen thal bas and their buddhafields it is maintained that Dzogchen teachings are presently found during this epoch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 30th, 2013 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, Tibetan Buddhism in India is pretty moribund.

The best work in Tibetan Buddhism by Tibetans is being done in Tibet.

Also the best practitioners and Lamas are in Tibet for the most part, not in India.

The Tibetans in Tibet are not really thrilled with the diaspora Tibetans.

anjali said:

Would you, or someone else also in the know, say more about this? As someone with absolutely no insight into the current state of Buddhism within Tibet, I get the impression that the backbone of Buddhism in Tibet has been broken and that cultural genocide by China is steadily proceeding. Is this not the case? Is Buddhism within Tibet

resilient? Or is it fragmented to the point of unsustainability, even though there may be strong pockets of practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Quite the opposite -- Dharma in Tibet, while under siege, has experienced a massive intellectual resurgence, especially in Eastern Tibet, Amdo and Golok -- with thousands of books being published in Tibetan language every year on all subjects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa & Someone with Tantric Initiation: Difference?

Content:

Kunzang8 said:

Hi

1) What is the difference between someone who is a Ngakpa and someone who has taken higher tantric initiations - don't they have the same Tantric vows and commitments. I suppose it would be correct to say all Ngakpas are Tantric practitioners but not all Tantric practitioners are Ngakpas?

2) If one is a Ngakpa is it normal for such a person later to decide to become an ordained monk? Or for an ordained monk who for whatever reason later to become a Ngakpa (I'm not talking about reverting to being an ordinary lay person but a Ngakpa in the traditional sense). Anyone know such examples?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of people like to wear a stripped robe these days, and call themselves a Ngakpa, but if your mantras have no force and power, then just what is the point of calling yourself a Mantrika? Not much.

Even if you have the formal sngags pa empowerment like me, hesitate to call yourself a sngags pa if your mantras have about as much force as wind on a still hot humid summers day.

Adamantine said:

Malcolm, did you encounter many/any ngakpas in your Tibet travels?

Malcolm wrote:

A few.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa & Someone with Tantric Initiation: Difference?

Content:

Kunzang8 said:

Hi

1) What is the difference between someone who is a Ngakpa and someone who has taken higher tantric initiations - don't they have the same Tantric vows and commitments. I suppose it would be correct to say all Ngakpas are Tantric practitioners but not all Tantric practitioners are Ngakpas?

2) If one is a Ngakpa is it normal for such a person later to decide to become an ordained monk? Or for an ordained monk who for whatever reason later to become a Ngakpa (I'm not talking about reverting to being an ordinary lay person but a Ngakpa in the traditional sense). Anyone know such examples?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of people like to wear a stripped robe these days, and call themselves a Ngakpa, but if your mantras have no force and power, then just what is the point of calling yourself a Mantrika? Not much.

Even if you have the formal sngags pa empowerment like me, hesitate to call yourself a sngags pa if your mantras have about as much force as wind on a still hot humid summers day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

anjali said:

So, although "mindness" is not your usual translation of sems-nyid, I think it works fairly well.

Malcolm wrote:

Its ok, it just sounds weird to me, and honestly, it does not really convey the genitive sense of sems kyi chos nyid i.e. the dharmatā of the mind, which is in my opinion what the term sems nyid is generally glossing in Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sems nyid is a translation of cittatā or citta dharmatā. The tā suffix can mean essence; it can also simply mean "is"; or also "itself" -- as you know it clearly depends on context.

In the example you give above, "the mind essence is the primal nature (prakṛti) of the mind", also redundant, but as you know sometimes tibetan texts are like that.

mutsuk said:

sems nyid as essence of mind does not help much if one comes across sems nyid sems kyi ngo bo yin (the essence of the mind is the essence of the mind). Nyid is a simple reflexive tattva case.

Malcolm wrote:

You can render it this way: the mind essence is the entity of the mind.

In Tibetan it is always redundant, "the mind itself is the essence of mind" is also redundant.

That is why it necessary to look for context. It depends on whether nyid is rendering eva i.e. just so, etc. or tā as in chos nyid.

For example "'DI DAG GIS NI SEMS NYID GZUGS SU SNANG BA NYID DU BSTAN TO"
"Both of those are the mind itself (or just the mind, only the mind) shown as appearing as matter/form" This is clearly an "eva" usage.

Here however we have a sems nyid aka sems kyi chos nyid:

SGRON MA GSAL BAR BYED PA ZHES BYA BA'I RGYA CHER BSHAD PA:
RANG GI SEMS KYI CHOS NYID LA GNAS PA NI RANG GI SEMS KYI ROL BA'O "Abiding in the nature [dharmatā] of one's mind is the play of one's mind"

Or

DBU MA RIN PO CHE'I SGRON MA ZHES BYA BA:

GANG GI TSE GZUGS LA SOGS PA'I DMIGS PA RNAMS SEMS LAS PHYI ROL NA MI
SNANG BA DE'I TSE RANG GI SEMS KYI CHOS NYID LA NGES PAR GNAS PA'I SEMS NI

GNYIS SU MED PA'I YE SHES ZHES BYA

When the perceptions of matter and so on do not appear external to the mind, at that time the mind that definitely abides in the nature [dharmatā] of one's mind is called "non-dual wisdom".

So basically, the issue is distinguishing sems nyid as cittaiva and sems nyid as a gloss for citta dharmatā -- and sometimes that can be difficult.

For example, if we take your example and apply the principle that sems nyid here means sems kyi chos nyid, your sentence in both instances makes more sense "The dharmatā (nature) of the mind is the primal nature of the mind" and "The dharmatā (nature) of the mind is the essence/entity of the mind". It becomes a little strange if we say "The mind itself is the primal nature of the mind" or "The mind itself is the essence/entity of the mind" -- so the cittaiva does not work here.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen VS Mahamudra..why?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Maybe I am just an uneducated rube but perhaps someone can explain to me why there is so much dissension. "Theyre the same" VS "theyre not the same". This seems to crop up a lot and I for one just dont get it. On the one hand you have Garab Dorje, Vimalamitra, Vairocana, Manjushrimitra, etc etc up until present day. All great Totally Realized Masters. On the other hand you have Naropa, Tilopa, Marpa, Milarepa, etc etc up until present day..also great Totally Realized Masters. It doesn't take much reading to see that their methods were different...vive la diferance...But ultimately Total Realization is Total Realization, right??? If a person hears/reads about Garab Dorje or Milarepa and one of those strikes a chord in them isn't that the most important thing? Hopefully somebody here can definitively clear this up for me....because I just don't get it

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is, generally speaking, a gradual path, Dzogchen isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

mitsuk said:

However, as far as translation is concerned, I don't know why but in English Mind (sems-nyid) is often (always?) rendered by "nature of the mind". This is actually a definition not a translation. Sems-nyid is "Mind itself" or "Mind" if you want to drop the "itself".

Choosing Mind or Mind itself would help avoiding ridiculous renderings when encountering sentences like "sems-nyid sems kyi rang bzhin yin/" -- "The nature of the mind (sems-nyid) is the nature of the mind (sems kyi rang bzhin)", which I guess all here

would consider as silly, no?

Malcolm wrote:

Sems nyid is a translation of cittatā or citta dharmatā. The tā suffix can mean essence; it can also simply mean "is"; or also "itself" -- as you know it clearly depends on context.

In the example you give above, "the mind essence is the primal nature (prakṛti) of the mind", also redundant, but as you know sometimes tibetan texts are like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 29th, 2013 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Clarence said:

Malcolm,

Would you mind explaining the difference?

THanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa, vidya, is the recognition of the basis of the individual.

dzogchungpa said:

So basically it's atma vidya, no?

Malcolm wrote:

Atmya sthana vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Nature of Mind

Content:

Jikan said:

In ChNN's diction, "rigpa" is "instant presence": the recognition of the nature of mind. "being in it."

the nature of mind (sems nyid) is something like a latent capacity that is unrecognized, right? so the difference between the two is being in on the secret, getting it, recognizing it? which is to say, it's a kind of knowledge?

I get this confused from time to time; if I'm still upside-down on this, I do hope someone will set me right.

heart said:

The nature of mind and the natural state are the same, so recognizing the nature of mind and rigpa is the same.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, rig pa can be called "recognizing the nature the mind". You always have "the nature of mind".

Of course, there are Dzogchen teachings which criticize this approach however, because it is held that buddhahood cannot be found in the mind.

So calling rig pa "the recognition of the nature of the mind" is quite provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

heart said:

I certainly never heard him do that distinction, nor have I ever heard anyone else do it except for you Malcolm.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You need to listen more carefully then to what ChNN says, or listen to more retreats.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

In the grand scheme of things...

Malcolm wrote:

In the grand scheme of things there is almost nothing one can do to stem the suffering of others in samsara. Not even Buddha can remove the suffering of others. However, one can remove one's own suffering. And for this reason these sorts of conversations, in the grand scheme of things, are critically important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 7:35 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is not an argument for a lesser evil, in my opinion. It is a very different kind of argument, it is an argument for the greatest good.

Indrajala said:

Potatoh, potatoe.

Malcolm wrote:

You are ignoring the explicit argument that this form of killing, far from being evil, is actually meritorious, and benefits everyone involved, especially the person being killed. Lesser evil thought experiments never run along these lines.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 4:02 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Clarence said:

Malcolm,

Would you mind explaining the difference?

THanks, C

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa, vidya, is the recognition of the basis of the individual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 3:39 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rig pa is not the nature of the mind.

heart said:

really, how come ChNNR says so every single retreat?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

He makes a clear distinction rig pa and the nature of the mind, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 10:30 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

In our world it is often about choosing the lesser of evils.

Malcolm wrote:

This is hardly a Buddhist ethic, Mahāyāna or otherwise.

Indrajala said:

Are you unaware of the Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra?

“If the bodhisattva sees a thief about to kill many beings out of a craving for wealth, or about to harm a venerable śrāvaka, pratyekabuddha or bodhisattva, or about to create much karma [for which he will be reborn in] Avīci Hell, seeing such things he thinks, 'If I sever that evil being's life I will fall into hell [naraka]. If it not be severed, then the karma [for which he will be reborn in] Avīci Hell will see him undergo much suffering. I should kill him and fall into hell rather than ever allow him to undergo the suffering of Avīci Hell.' Like this the bodhisattva makes an aspiration and thinks, 'I will have a virtuous or neutral mind towards the being.' Knowing in the future what is to come, he thus generates deep shame and with a compassionate mind severs the life [of the thief]. It is due to these causes and conditions that there is no violation of the bodhisattva precepts, and much merit is produced.”

Malcolm wrote:

That is not an argument for a lesser evil, in my opinion. It is a very different kind of argument, it is an argument for the greatest good.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

In our world it is often about choosing the lesser of evils.

Malcolm wrote:

This is hardly a Buddhist ethic, Mahāyāna or otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

...all this seems, well... really, unbelievably, like completely... pointless and lacking any essence. So sorry for the attitude.

Malcolm wrote:

The suffering of samsara is horrible.

Actually understanding what the term "rig pa" means is important for those who wish to end their suffering, since all Dharma paths, both Hindu and Buddhist, define the cause of suffering as ignorance (avidyā, ma rig pa) and the cause of liberation as knowledge (vidyā, rig pa).

Understanding the distinction between Mahāmudra and Dzogchen is important for those who wish to follow one path versus the other, for whatever their personal reasons may be. For others the distinction may not be important.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Let's see how finely we can split this hair now, shall we?

Clarence said:

It is actually an important difference as Malcolm just showed.

gregkavarnos said:

Yes, I am sure it is, coz now that you know that sems nyid is not Rig pa, well, now you just realised the essential state, whereas up to now you only realised the nature of mind. That's how important that was. Right?

Malcolm wrote:

Are you generally going to be this snotty from now on? Or are you just having a day?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Yes, why bother to be precise when dealing with central concepts of practice? It's all just words anyway, man.

Or we can get all anally retentive about it, and split hairs all day about what is (or is not) mind, whether Mahamudra is Dzogchen, whether they differ in terms of practice or not, whether we are talking about ground or sutra mahamudra, etc... and clutter up yet another thread with the same old boring endless repetitive and essentially useless distracting discussion (ie views) since Dzogchen/Mahamudra essentially only requires pointing out for you to get it, and everything else is just (more) verbal flatulence.

Malcolm wrote:

Your reply amounts to repeating what he said:

"It's all just words anyway, man"

In other words, your reply was essentially pointless.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Jikan said:

I'd thought that rigpa was often but not always translated as "nature of mind."

I don't mean to throw the whole thread off track, but... what's the difference between "nature of mind" and "rigpa" in your usage, Malcolm?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

The term "sems nyid" is the term translated as the "nature of the mind".

Rig pa is knowledge of your primordial state.

They are not the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

heart said:

[

You think perhaps in Dzogchen you realize something different?
My Guru teach both Dzogchen and Mahamudra.

/magnus

Karma Dorje said:
The realization is the same. The paths are different.

heart said:
This statement just define the relationship between mind and nature of mind (sem and rigpa), equally valid for both paths.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Rig pa is not the nature of the mind.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 2:10 AM
Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit
Content:
JKhedrup said:
Yes, and as China becomes a net food importer this will pose a whole new set of additional pressures.

Malcolm wrote:
Indeed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 1:25 AM
Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit
Content:
Indrajala said:
Look at what a catastrophic failure Gandhi and his team were.

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is not correct.

Indrajala said:

Partition resulted in millions of avoidable deaths and untold suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Not Gandhi's fault. He actively opposed Partition. In fact the Congress Party was entirely opposed to it.

Partition was brought about by the Mountbatten plan, in response to the Muslim League's demands for a separate state, and almost entirely contrived by the British.

Indrajala said:

The British did a lot of good in India and it'd be nice if people recognized that.

Malcolm wrote:

The harm to India done by the British to India was recognized from the beginning:

Edmund Burke in a speech said:

What would you call it? To call it tyranny sublimed into madness would be too faint an image; yet this very madness is the principle upon which the ministers at your right hand have proceeded in their estimate of the revenues of the Carnatic, when they were providing, not supply for the establishments of its protection, but rewards for the authors of its ruin...Never did oppression light the nuptial torch; never did extortion and usury spread out the genial bed. Do any of you think that England, so wasted, would, under such a nursing attendance, so rapidly and cheaply recover?

<http://www.ourcivilisation.com/smartboard/shop/burkee/extracts/chap11.htm>

Indrajala said:

They weren't perfect and there were plenty of opportunistic characters, sure, but overall they did more good than harm. If you look at the mess India is in today, you might appreciate how British colonial rule made a lot of sense even back in the day.

Malcolm wrote:

The mess India is today is a direct result of British Mismanagement and interference in India civilization.

Indrajala said:

It was the British who rediscovered many of the Buddhist sites around the subcontinent, too. Their contributions to Indology can't be overlooked.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, someday someone will quip -- "The Chinese contribution to Tibetology cannot be over looked." Hardly even a booby prize, and of little concern to Indians for whom Buddhadharma had been dead for more than a thousand years.

Indrajala said:

That's absurd. The state which has a monopoly on violence has overwhelming authority over the populace.

Malcolm wrote:

The British thought that, and they were wrong in the case of the Colonies, in the case of India and a number of other places.

Indrajala said:

That's just reality.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is conservative defeatism. History does not bear your pessimism out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: What is the Definitive Source?

Content:

oushi said:

Maybe it's not a good moment to ask this, but anyway can someone give a commentary on this:

Listen! You state of pure and total presence,

And all sentient beings of the three realms,

Are clearly shown to be the teacher.

Because you have not seen your mind as the teacher,

Even after 100,000 aeons,

When I, the majestic creativity of the universe,

Manifest as the teacher, you own mind,

You should listen to this message: Your own mind is the teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

You can get Valby's books and see how this is commented on there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Tibet is controlled by the PRC. The land now belongs to them in practice and by the agreement of the international community. The Tibetans were conquered by force of arms and continue to be subjugated. This is how the real world works unfortunately: the PRC has a monopoly of violence in Tibet, so they run the show.

Malcolm wrote:

Imagine Gandhi telling the Indians to give into the Brits, because the Brits had the monopoly on violence.

Imagine Martin Luther King Jr. telling his congregation to just give in to the Southern Whites because they had a monopoly of violence.

History shows that a monopoly on violence does not guarantee power. In fact it often shows instability.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

I don't take either side. I do, however, believe the Tibetans and Tibetan Buddhism would be best served in India and Nepal unless China suddenly collapses,

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, Tibetan Buddhism in India is pretty moribund.

The best work in Tibetan Buddhism by Tibetans is being done in Tibet.

Also the best practitioners and Lamas are in Tibet for the most part, not in India.

The Tibetans in Tibet are not really thrilled with the diaspora Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

it is best to rely, as much as possible, on unemotional observation.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

I don't know where people get the idea I have an aversion to Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, go back and read what you write, if you are so puzzled.

You have spent a fair amount of time arguing that Tibetan political incompetence lead to the diaspora; that Tibetan independence is a fruitless cause; that there is no point in trying to preserve Tibetan culture, language and customs; that Tibetans do not really have a right to self-determination because it is inconsistent with Chinese real politik; that Tibetans should basically lie back and enjoy the Chinese rape of Tibetan land, culture and environment since according to you there is nothing they can do about it anyway. When you are met with indignity at your unfeeling proclamations, you then assert that people are "idealistic", unrealistic", and so on. In short you demonstrate cold-heartedness in the name of political pragmatism, and seem to care nothing about the human costs of the political situations you are commenting upon.

You have generally castigated Tibetan Buddhism for being successful in the west, and castigated Tibetan Buddhists for adopting Tibetan Buddhism.

So it is not surprising to me at all that people think you have a negative attitude about Tibetans and Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is a problem with most people. Not Buddhists in particular.

Indrajala said:

Buddhists though, my experience, tend to be even more idealistic than usual.

It is like they dislike war and therefore think it should go away because they find it disagreeable.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to get out more often.

There are many people far more idealistic than Buddhists, such as climate change advocates and so on.

In general, my experience of Buddhists is that they are pretty pessimistic, like you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: What is the Definitive Source?

Content:

Astus said:

Is there a definitive source of Dzogchen teachings? I mean, if I want to check whether a teaching given is authentic, is there a written canon that can confirm or deny the validity of a doctrine or method? Like, can the tantras be used for this, or the writings of certain masters? Or is it only the living lineage holders who can serve as accepted sources?

Malcolm wrote:

The definitive source of Dzogchen teachings is a Buddha by the name of Garab Dorje. He taught the tantras of the three series, sems sde, klong sde and man ngag sde. Secondly, there are the various instructions that attached to these three series, such as the Vima snyin thig and so on. Finally, there are the surviving commentaries on these various texts. Then there are commentaries written by early Tibetan masters such as Vairocana and Nub Sangye Yeshe, etc. Finally there are the commentaries of Longchenpa.

This taken together can be understood as the definitive sources for Dzogchen teachings.

Of course, without a living Guru, one cannot receive transmission into Dzogchen teaching, and without that transmission, all these books are just so much dry tinder.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: What is the Definitive Source?

Content:

Sönam said:

Only confidence can help in this case ... and peoples having recognized there true nature recognize each others, that's the only point.

It is also not a question of being sure of the master, because the one who recognize is You, not the master.

If it is said that this realization is ineffable, it's because it is ... what ever would be the way we try.

Trust me, once, we the energy of the master, you've realized your nature ... doubt is eliminated.

Astus said:

That means there is no way to decide who is or who is not an authentic Dzogchen teacher. Either you recognise someone as such or not, but it's completely arbitrary. Consequently there is no basis for debating anyone's claim to being a realised Dzogchen master.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no basis for debating anyone's claim to being realized at all, including the

Buddha's claims about his own realization. One either believes it or one does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: HHDL leaving Dharamsala?

Content:

Indrajala said:

All things considered, I think McLeodganj is rather cramped. HHDL gives public teachings and Namgyal isn't really able to accommodate the crowds so well. Some people have to sit upstairs or downstairs and watch a TV monitor.

Malcolm wrote:

Simply put, South India is nicer than North India. The food is better, the people nicer. Mysore is a decent city, Bangalore supposed to be even better.

HHDL is basically a Nyingmapa anyway, so it is fitting for him to be installed in a Nyingma monastery.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

This is a problem I find with a lot of Buddhists. They're idealistic and like to talk about what ought to happen rather than what probably will.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a problem with most people. Not Buddhists in particular.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 27th, 2013 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Who holds the highest throne?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Traditionally the "pyramid" of the stature of the various lamas went something like this, according to the political structure: Dalai Lama, Panchen Lama, Sakya Trizin, Karmapa, Ganden Tripa.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, HHDL, Sakya Trizin, Karmapa, etc. There is a text about this by Khyentse Wangpo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 26th, 2013 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

Thank you Malcolm, that's very interesting, as usual. Karma and original sin.....hmmmm.....? wondering if the idea of original sin is similar to the idea of "ignorance" in dzogchen.....and if Dzogchen thinks that teachers like Jesus removed all the negative karma from all Christians, or that other teachers removed all the negative karma from followers of their teachings? Don't want to keep bugging you Malcolm, if you are busy, but just always wondered about this, if anyone has any teachings on the subject.

b.f.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the teaching of Dzogchen is actually very simple: the difference between a buddha (awakened without the performance of even the smallest virtuous deeds) and a sentient being (wandering in samsara without initially having performed the least non-virtuous deed) is the simple recognition or non-recognition of one's own state.

There is, according to ChNN, no possible way to remove all the negative karma accumulated for countless lifetimes in samsara. So it is impossible that a teacher likewise can do this for one, from the perspective of Dzogchen teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 26th, 2013 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing particularly Dzogchen about any of this apart from the citation of Tulku Orgyen's statement.

But as I understand the intent behind this book, it is quite early and is deliberately geared toward an audience that has no knowledge at all of what Dzogchen is or might be, and is therefore intentionally ecumenical.

In reality, there is no relationship between the concept of original sin and karma.

Barney Fife said:

Quotes from "Essence of Mind: An Approach to Dzogchen" by Jes Bertelsen:

"There are many types of continuous exercises. They could be divided into two large main categories. One type is a kind of preparation for meditation: channeling exercises, circulation exercises, and the use of symbolic images (channeling and circulation exercises such as the pineal-hara or yin-yang-breathing described in Presence Meditation, symbols such as a flower or a candle or a yantra in a chakra). The second type is the quintessence of prayer, centered in the heart in the form of a mantra (such as Jesus Christ; Kyrie eleison, Kriste eleison; La illah il allah; Namu amida butsu) (Kindle location 1122; p. 87)

"The other main reason that these continuous exercises are necessary is our dim Precambrian lethargy, with regard to achieving greater wakefulness. In the West, this feature has been accurately described as original sin. In the East it is called negative karma. These terms indicate that the sluggishness reaches beyond the personal and deeply into our collective hereditary backgrounds. It is a feature that is embedded in evolution itself, in our genes, in the collective unconscious." (Kindle Location 1026-130; p.80).

"It is self-evidently true that the great enlightened ones on this earth eliminate original sin and negative karma. But it is just as self-evident-- and we all see this, every day in the media-- that this does not help in the least unless each of us as individuals help the process along, with psychotherapy, ethics, prayer, meditation, and continuous exercises.

Even though this earth has seen a long line of radiant, enlightened teachers (Rumi, Krishna, Buddha, Christ, Francis, Rabia, Meera, Yeshe Tsogyel, Teresa, etc.), and even though each of them, according to their individual capacity and caliber, takes on original sin and purifies it for all the rest of us, this does not help one bit unless each individual lends a hand, too. Frankly, the world has not become a better place, and people have not improved, since the Buddha and the Christ. Rather the opposite-- when seen from the ordinary levels of consciousness.

Even though there are one billion Christians on the planet, and Christ has accepted the total load of original sin for all these one billion Christians, it doesn't work. It is only when the individual does his share of the work (psychotherapy, prayer, ethical behavior, meditation, and continuous exercises) that it turns out, again and again, that at the right moment, when the mystery opens, the enlightened consciousness has already purified the negative karma and has taken and forgiven the original sin. But this divine function can only unfold when the individual human being has prepared himself or herself through existential transformation.

The old teachers bear witness to the divine power of enlightened consciousness to eliminate original sin and negative karma for oneself and others.

Master Eckhart speaks in the West:

"Indeed, you might well turn away quickly and in a short time from all sins, so strongly and with such true revulsion, and turn so strongly to God that, though you had committed all the sins that ever were or shall be since Adam's time, they would all be forgiven you, together with the punishment for them...."

Master Tulku Urgyen speaks in the East:

"One moment in the purest rigpa can eliminate the accumulation of negative karma from a whole lifetime, or even from several lifetimes."

(Kindle Locations 1046-1064; p.81-82)

"Up to this point in the book, the description of the spiritual developmental process all the way to the process of enlightenment has been kept within the context of one lifetime, namely the present one. And-- as it is emphasized for instance in both Christian and Tibetan mysticism-- experience does show that it is possible for a person to realize the enlightenment process in one lifetime. However, Indian spiritual traditions (such as Vedanta, Jainism, Mahayana), among others, maintain that the process of spiritual enlightenment usually extends over several lifetimes, and that it is embedded in a more impersonal overarching developmental continuum. This development includes the process of the self through the progressive karma, as well as the collective karmic process at the level of joint consciousness."

(Kindle Location 1368-1374; p.106)

Would anyone be kind enough to offer some incisive Dzogchen commentary on the above passages of Jes Bertelsen's teachings? Possibly Malcolm, or someone with knowledge of the Dzogchen teachings? Thanks!

b.f.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

padma norbu said:

Hmm, I skipped right to 27 minutes in where he says the thangka tradition has it's origins in shamanic culture and psychoactive substance usage, which, if true, is very interesting.

Malcolm wrote:

It's is total nonsense, of course. The orgins of thangkha art are well understood and documented, being a form of canonical painting formalized over more than a millennia.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

In the end they might last longer in the game than the USA.

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt it -- I vote China the country most likely to degenerate into provinces run by warlords -- they are halfway there (again) already, and things are only being very tenuously tied together by an increasingly moribund and irrelevant Communist Party leadership.

They do not have the resources the western hemisphere has, they do not have the technology, their environment is ruined, there is massive social unrest with frequent riots, and their political system is moribund as well, as noted above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

By all means we have to be mindful and cautious about these things, especially if we have seen the detrimental effects they can have on some people, but we must also be open to the possibility that used under proper guidance ,in a ceremonial ritualistic setting, with careful intent,prayer,mantra,meditation, there can be benefit and merit to the path, even if it is only a temporary vehicle for some, a medicine for others, and a guru of boundless wisdom and compassion for others.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever its benefits may be, the "shaman"'s path is a worldly path, and does not lead to liberation in the sense that those who follow Buddhadharma understand the term "liberation", which specifically means freedom from rebirth in samsara at its most basic level.

Actually, Beyer makes this quite clear in the beginning of his book about Ayahauceros, citing an example of a huge magical war that lead to the death of some his friends on one side at the magical hands of other of his friends on the other side.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 10:51 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

China doesn't need to improve its image anyway. It has the world by the balls financially and industrially.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really -- they are facing a credit bubble, a real estate bubble, their industries are

actually operating at losses in general, all to prop up a growing consumer class.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

And Malcom, this is why i'm here. To learn from those of you with valuable advice and to disregard the Forum/Buddhist elitism many other people display.

.

Malcolm wrote:

The bardo of dharmatā itself has nothing to do with other beings -- it is a direct experience of the ultimate reality of your own state. You can also have that experience in this life, but not with drugs -- they just get in the way because they alter how you directly perceive things, they alter your sensory apparatus and nervous system. And that, from the point of view of directly experiencing your own state, is negative.

Of course, if you want to talk to plants on the other hand, well, then ayahuasca seems to have some positive qualities in that respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

The reason i mentioned Ayawaska and a perception of the Bardo/ astral plane is because it is known to dissolve our normal barriers of ordinary perception .Maybe i am using too many syncretic terms interchangeably without elaborating enough but i think there's a lot to be learnt from the knowledge and connection to the world ,other beings and transcendental states that ayawaska can act as a catylyst for.

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to actually understand the Bardo I suggest you place yourself at the feet of a Dzogchen master and learn what he has to teach you. You are just engaged in a lot of intellectual speculation, and some of us have been there years before you, and actually may have some useful advice for you to follow. But it is up to you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

padma norbu said:

Supposedly, she was medically dead, though.

Malcolm wrote:

Medically "dead" to a Tibetan physician might not be quite the same thing as medically dead to a Western one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

smcj said:

So who were they financed by and why?

Sandoz patented LSD in 1945. If they still have the patent they would benefit. If it is in the public domain, then nobody could make a killing. It would be like aspirin. I don't think you can patent a plant.

I heard that the head of Harvard psychiatry (or psychology?) wants to make MDMA a prescription drug for couples therapy. But a German company patented it in 1915, along with a lot of other forms of amphetamine, so the it has run out. Thus no push by big pharmaceuticals means no legislative action.

Hard to see who would benefit financially from a study like that. But that doesn't mean there aren't other agendas in play.

Malcolm wrote:

The patent ran out on LSD in 1968.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

padma norbu said:

Malcolm, the follow-up question for clarity's sake... Chagdud Tulku's mother was a famous delog. As a child, she apparently "died" for several days and came back to write about her experiences traveling through the bardos and hells, etc. with Tara as her guide (the book "Delog" is available on Amazon). Who's to say that was real or DMT other than her? I read it and I can't say I actually believe it anymore than any other OBE experience I've ever read about.

Malcolm wrote:

IN every instant in her book she is talking about the bardo of rebirth, not the chos nyid bar do. Those with clairvoyance can perceive the beings in the bardo of rebirth and that is who she is universally talking about.

There is another famous Delog, Shardza Tashi Gyaltsen, also has many similar descriptions. I have not really studied this kind of literature in detail. I don't think we really need to consider it an OBE since she never actually experienced total death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am merely reporting to you what the Dzogchen tantras which first present the concept of a bardo of dharmatā say about it.

padma norbu said:

I know and thanks for that. I wish you would respond to my assessment of that rather than repeating that you are citing tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

"Nondual" in Dzogchen does not mean everything is the same in the one without a second (Brahman, Advaita Vedanta); it means that ontic pairs such as existence and non-existence cannot be found. What nondual really means in Dzogchen is that everything is in a state of liberation from the beginning, not the absence of diversity with respect to this and that thing.

padma norbu said:

I know, which is why I posed the question I posed.

Malcolm wrote:

A person who is liberated will not experience the bardo of dharmatā at all.

A person who is not completely liberated will experience the bardo of dharmatā after the separation of their mind from their body. The proposed mechanism by which this occurs is the adoption of a mental body which experiences the bardo. But this only occurs after one loses consciousness during the detachment of the consciousness from body i.e. the total disengagement of consciousness from this body, resulting in total physical death. If one does not recognize one's appearances in this bardo, then one continues on the next bardo, the bardo of rebirth i.e. srid pa'i bar do.

It does not matter at all what hallucinations a person has when they are dying, it is not the bardo of dharmatā by definition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I could cite any number of tantras which clearly explain that that the bardo of dharmatā does not occur until the complete separation of the body and mind. Since the body is not longer a factor, any sensory distortion created by any chemistry in the brain is irrelevant. It might make dying easier, but it has not effect on the bardo of dharmatā and its experiences of sound, lights and rays.

padma norbu said:

So, then, it's as I said: you basically have to have faith in what someone else has said. I'm not sure how you could exactly make the distinction of "separation of mind and body" in this instance, anyway, since a DMT experience, especially at the time of death, could very definitely be considered 'separation of mind and body.'

I'm not arguing for DMT in any way, just something that occurs to me as I read your apparently definitive statements. We live in a nondual reality we experience as duality in our everyday world, so what is "separation from the body?"

Malcolm wrote:

I am merely reporting to you what the Dzogchen tantras which first present the concept of a bardo of dharmatā say about it.

"Nondual" in Dzogchen does not mean everything is the same in the one without a second (Brahman, Advaita Vedanta); it means that ontic pairs such as existence and non-existence cannot be found. What nondual really means in Dzogchen is that everything is in a state of liberation from the beginning, not the absence of diversity with respect to this and that thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, these two studies were paid for by all the companies lining up to sell Ayahuasca, LSD, etc.

gregkavarnos said:

So who were they financed by and why?

Malcolm wrote:

The Norwegian study as sponsored by "...the Research Council of Norway. The authors, Dr. Johnson, and Dr. Bolstridge report no relevant financial relationships." You can look that up yourself, nothing dodgy I can see.

I cannot find information about who may have funded the Spanish study. But it looks like a pretty straightforward academic study to me, also published in the same journal as the Norwegian study.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

I propose that correct application of Ayawaska from a dharma perspective can actually provide first-hand, direct experience and understanding of the Dying process while still alive in incarnation.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, actually, I cannot go along with this. Why? Because in fact there is no need for Ayahuasca to have this understanding, and in fact, while there may be many salutary benefits of ingesting psychedelics, insight in the bardo of dharmatā is just not one of them.

There are two systems of bardo explanation: one that comes from the new translation schools -- it is very brief, mainly concerns the moment of death, and so on. The second comes directly from the tantras of Dzogchen and concerns the visionary experience called dharmatā-antarabhāva i.e. the interval existence of dharmatā or chos nyid bar do. Taking psychedelics such as acid, dmt, shrooms, etc., simply will not cause you to understand what this experience is.

It is not, as is commonly imagined, related to the fact that the brain apparently releases large quantities of DMT when one dies. Why? Because the experience of the bard of dharmatā occurs after the separation of the body and mind.

Instead the experience of the dharmatā is indicated with a detailed system of twenty-one introductions; none of which require ingesting anything whatsoever. In fact, they require that you are sober and paying attention.

In the system (Dzogchen) from which the bardo of dharmatā comes from there is only one valid use for psychedelics, as I have mentioned elsewhere -- and that is demonstrating to oneself that the mind is not a fixed unalterable substance. Once you have gained that insight, that is all the insight any Buddhist text in any tradition has ever suggested that you can derive from psychedelics. Now then, I am not saying that there are no other benefits to be gained from tripping -- but they are not benefits described in nor recognized by any form of Buddhism.

M

padma norbu said:

Thanks for this explanation. And, not to be a dick or anything, but where's the proof for this statement: "It is not, as is commonly imagined, related to the fact that the brain apparently releases large quantities of DMT when one dies. Why? Because the experience of the bard of dharmatā occurs after the separation of the body and mind." ? I just recently read that, upon death, the DMT release causes a profound sense of time-distortion which causes a person to seemingly remain alive hours and even days after his body is dead. Since nobody knows precisely where consciousness is located, I'm not sure how anyone could definitively state whether or not the bardo is experienced after separation of body and mind or whether the mind is simply caught up in a DMT-fuelled experience. I suppose at some point you have to have faith in what someone else tells you or in your own perception of "the astral plane" / "bardo" what-have-you.

Malcolm wrote:

I could cite any number of tantras which clearly explain that that the bardo of dharmatā does not occur until the complete separation of the body and mind. Since the body is not longer a factor, any sensory distortion created by any chemistry in the brain is irrelevant. It might make dying easier, but it has not effect on the bardo of dharmatā and its experiences of sound, lights and rays.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

I propose that correct application of Ayawaska from a dharma perspective can actually provide first-hand, direct experience and understanding of the Dying process while still alive in incarnation.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, actually, I cannot go along with this. Why? Because in fact there is no need for Ayahuasca to have this understanding, and in fact, while there may be many salutary benefits of ingesting psychedelics, insight in the bardo of dharmatā is just not one of them.

There are two systems of bardo explanation: one that comes from the new translation schools -- it is very brief, mainly concerns the moment of death, and so on. The second comes directly from the tantras of Dzogchen and concerns the visionary experience called dharmatā-antarabhāva i.e. the interval existence of dharmatā or chos nyid bar do. Taking psychedelics such as acid, dmt, shrooms, etc., simply will not cause you to understand what this experience is.

It is not, as is commonly imagined, related to the fact that the brain apparently releases large quantities of DMT when one dies. Why? Because the experience of the bard of

dharmatā occurs after the separation of the body and mind.

Instead the experience of the dharmatā is indicated with a detailed system of twenty-one introductions; none of which require ingesting anything whatsoever. In fact, they require that you are sober and paying attention.

In the system (Dzogchen) from which the bardo of dharmatā comes from there is only one valid use for psychedelics, as I have mentioned elsewhere -- and that is demonstrating to oneself that the mind is not a fixed unalterable substance. Once you have gained that insight, that is all the insight any Buddhist text in any tradition has ever suggested that you can derive from psychedelics. Now then, I am not saying that there are no other benefits to be gained from tripping -- but they are not benefits described in nor recognized by any form of Buddhism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The outcome of a study depends on who funds the researchers and why.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, these two studies were paid for by all the companies lining up to sell Ayahuasca, LSD, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

smcj said:

We found no relation between lifetime use of psychedelics and any undesirable past year mental health outcomes, including serious psychological distress, mental health treatment (inpatient, outpatient, medication, felt a need but did not receive), or symptoms of panic disorder, major depressive episode, mania, social phobia, generalized anxiety disorder, agoraphobia, posttraumatic stress disorder, or non-affective psychosis.

The outcome of this study would be radically different if my old high school buddies had been included.

Malcolm wrote:

I have friends from high school with whom I did enormous amounts of psychedelic drugs. In every case those who have psychological problems would have had those

problems whether they had done such drugs or not. And those who today are balanced, normal functioning people [the majority of my friends from high school] would have been normal, balanced functional people whether they had done those drugs or not. But they would be a little less open minded and kind, I think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

Your naive statement above is illustrative of idealism rather than a firm grasp on the political reality.

Malcolm wrote:

My statement is neither naive nor idealistic.

China can certainly ensure the wellbeing of its billion people whether or not it has political control over Tibet.

Incidentally, I was not suggesting that the Chinese would ever voluntarily leave Tibet -- they are too foolish to make that wise choice.

They are going to plunge Asia, and the rest of the world, into war if they continue their presently unsustainable policies in the region.

My observations have nothing to do with Tibetan Nationalist politics (I am not Tibetan so their nationalism is not my fight). My observations have more to do with limits on human growth, preserving delicate environments and flora and fauna in them, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Also, in terms of mental health:

So what did the study find? Ayahuasca users were found to measure significantly lower than the controls on all nine psychopathology scales, including significantly less somatization, depression, anxiety, hostility, paranoid ideation, and phobias. The ayahuasca users scored significantly lower than controls on measures of worry, shyness, and fatigability and weakness. And ayahuasca users scored significantly higher than controls on measures of self-transcendence and spiritual orientation, including on such items as transpersonal identification, self-forgetfulness, sacredness of life, altruism, subjective well-being, and mission in life. "Taken together," the authors

state, “the data point at better general mental health and bio-psycho-social adaptation in the ayahuasca-using group compared to the control subjects.”

<http://www.singingtotheplants.com/2012/08/new-ayahuasca-study/>

Further, psychedelics are not innately harmful, as many studies have shown and as this one reinforces, just published on monday:

We found no relation between lifetime use of psychedelics and any undesirable past year mental health outcomes, including serious psychological distress, mental health treatment (inpatient, outpatient, medication, felt a need but did not receive), or symptoms of panic disorder, major depressive episode, mania, social phobia, generalized anxiety disorder, agoraphobia, posttraumatic stress disorder, or non-affective psychosis. In addition to not being significantly different from no association, in all cases the calculated adjusted odds ratios (aOR) were small (for all, psychedelic use aOR ≤ 1.2). Stratifying by age, gender, past year illicit drug use, or lifetime extremely stressful event did not substantially change the results of any of the logistic regression analyses. Likewise, lifetime use of LSD, psilocybin, mescaline, or peyote, or past year use of LSD, was not associated with a higher rate of mental health problems. There were a number of weak associations between use of any psychedelic or use of specific psychedelics and lower rate of mental health problems; these results might reflect beneficial effects of psychedelic use, relatively better initial mental health among people who use psychedelics, or chance “false positive” findings. Our results are consistent with assessments of the harm potential of psychedelics [28], [29] and with information provided by UN, EU, US, and UK official drug education programs [15], [30]–[34], insofar as these sources do not conclude that psychedelics are demonstrated to cause lasting anxiety, depression, or psychosis.

<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0063972#authorcontrib>

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/21/psychedelics-mental-health-problems_n_3785772.html

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Vasana said:

Any thoughts on the other points i raised?

gregkavarnos said:

My opinion is that Ayahuasca is as sentient, sacred, or as special as any other plant. That's what I think.

Malcolm wrote:

Ayahuasca is not one plant. It is two or more: *Banisteriopsis caapi* mixed with *Diplopterys cabrerana*, *Psychotria viridis*, or *Psychotria carthagenensis* — plants that contain DMT.

If you are interested in being more informed about the uses, culture and religious significance of Ayahuasca, I suggest you secure Steven V. Bayer's (author of The Cult of Tara) recently published Singing to the Plants: A Guide to Mestizo Shamanism in the Upper Amazon. You can also examine the author's website:
<http://www.singingtotheplants.com>, more information.

He writes there:

The ayahuasca drink has several primary actions: it is a hallucinogen, emetic, purgative, and vermifuge. In fact, there is reason to think that the ayahuasca vine was first used for its emetic, purgative, and vermifuge activities. Even today, the ayahuasca drink is often called, simply, la purga, and used to induce violent vomiting, with hallucinations considered side-effects; indeed, ayahuasqueros are sometimes called purgueros. But the emetic effect of the ayahuasca drink has spiritual resonance as well; vomiting shows that the drinker is being cleansed. La purga misma te enseña, they say; vomiting itself teaches you.

And:

Rather, for the shaman, ayahuasca is a teaching plant; it is through the hallucinogenic power of the ayahuasca drink that the hundreds of healing plants, including the plants used for magical attack and defense, reveal their appearance and teach their songs; it is through the power of ayahuasca that the shaman can see distant galaxies and planets, the wellbeing of distant relatives, the location of lost objects, the lover of an unfaithful spouse, and the identity of the sorcerer who has caused a patient to become sick. It is the ayahuasca drink that nurtures the shaman's phlegm, the physical manifestation of shamanic power within the body, used both as defense against magical attack and as a container for the magic darts that are the shaman's principal weapon.

<http://www.singingtotheplants.com/what-is-ayahuasca/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 25th, 2013 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: China destroys the ancient Buddhist symbols of Lhasa Cit

Content:

Indrajala said:

If China was to walk out of Tibet tomorrow the well-being of a billion or more Chinese people would be compromised.

Malcolm wrote:

This windup is a totally indemonstrable assertion, one I suspect that arises from your not-very-subtle aversion towards the oft-touted "popularity" of Transhimalayan Buddhism amongst a very small section of upper middle-class white boomers in the US and Europe.

The wellbeing of the Chinese population would in no way will be compromised if the Chinese Govt. were to vacate its present western holdings.

As it stands, the Chinese Govt. is foolishly pushing Asia towards a resource war. A war in which everyone will lose, and there will be no winners at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

kirtu said:

Of course merit making is unnecessary for realizing Buddhahood.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Sapan is rolling in his grave.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

Are you suggesting these Lamas taught a position that differers from Tsongkhapa's as a type of skilful means, or is this support for your claim that Gelugpas do not hold any views?

Geshe Gyaltzen passed away in 2009. This discussion has lasted long enough that, we're he still alive, I'd drive down to see him and get clarification. If at some point I can access a geshe in my area, I plan on doing just that, but I'm not flying off to India in a panic.

In any case, until then, I do not concede the point. In your quote of Geshe S.R.: In the eleventh verse he mentions emptiness "free from all assertions." In the twelfth verse he refers to an understanding which "destroys through certainty the way the object is perceived." These phrases may be variously interpreted. "The mainstay of misconceptions" is generally viewed as true existence itself." The qualification of emptiness as being "free from all assertions" may be taken to mean that words cannot describe emptiness as it is. It can also refer to emptiness free from any assertions of intrinsic existence.

I take this as a confirmation that my position is one possible interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is, but he clarifies it is pre-Tsongkhapa position.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Barney Fife said:

i am familiar with the situation and all the parties involved, and have heard all versions of the jes bertelsen story. i can confirm that the version presented by the learned malcolm represents the version of jes bertelsen and his students, and that the version presented by the accomplished Adamantine represents the version of tulku urgyen rinpoche's close disciples.

b.f.

Malcolm wrote:

Well it is a good thing we have versions. It is starting to sound like Rashoman:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is what I was informed of...

dzogchungpa said:

I have to say that's pretty amazing. Maybe this guy is a real cig car ba.

Is that quote from an email or some other document?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't matter -- this is the main reason why Dzogchen was so hard to find in Tibet. All those people whose lively hoods depended on merit making activities were furious that Dzogchen asserts that accumulating merit and so on is unnecessary for realizing buddhahood.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is what I was informed of:

This transcribed account has been removed at Malcolm's request.

The only person who can confirm this with any authority is Eric. I suggest someone ask.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Jikan said:

Finally, even though I said I would hold my tongue on Bertelsen...

Malcolm wrote:

Its a fact that TU authorized him to teach Dzogchen.

heart said:

Really, how do you know that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Because one of our mutual friends who was in Nagi Gonpa at the time confirmed it to me when I asked him about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

90+% of the lectures I listened to as a young man about the Gelug Prasangika were from FPMT lamas: Lama Yeshe, Lama Zopa, Geshe Gyaltzen, Zong R., etc. That was a long time ago, but as I remember it, Tsongkhapa's contribution of how the interplay between the relative and absolute works did not result in producing a "view". In fact, it was only in the modern era that I found out that Tsongkhapa changed anything. They did not allow for alternative interpretations, what we were hearing was "the buddhist perspective". Nagarjuna's four points were stressed, as well as the absence of view. The phrase "non-affirming negation" was used extensively. Perhaps that is how they chose to teach a bunch of hippies at the time, but that has been, and still is, my education on the subject.

Malcolm wrote:

I have heard Lama Zopa teach extensively on emptiness, as well as HHDL -- they do not resemble at all what you report.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Kunzang Dechen Lingpa regularly excoriated his students (meaning us) for asking him to give empowerments all the time, insisting over and over again that knowledge of Dzogchen does not require this; and further, that the activities of giving empowerments and so on were mere child's play.

dzogchungpa said:

I have heard you say that before, and I have often thought about it. Was KDL's point that empowerments are basically a waste of time?

Malcolm wrote:

Not for childish people, apparently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Its a fact that TU authorized him to teach Dzogchen.

dzogchungpa said:

That's pretty remarkable. Did TU authorize any other westerners?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no idea. BTW, this does not mean that this guy is something like a lineage holder of Chokling Tersar or anything like that. But Dzogchen is a specific kind of knowledge that does not require a lot of elaborations to be communicated.

Kunzang Dechen Lingpa regularly excoriated his students (meaning us) for asking him to give empowerments all the time, insisting over and over again that knowledge of Dzogchen does not require this; and further, that the activities of giving empowerments and so on were mere child's play.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Jikan said:

Finally, even though I said I would hold my tongue on Bertelsen...

Malcolm wrote:

Its a fact that TU authorized him to teach Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

Jikan said:

I remember reading Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche's insistence on the practice of ngondro in some of his published writings, but I don't have access to those now. These comments might be relevant to the present conversation.

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 24th, 2013 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

heart said:

A question for the students of Jes Bertelsen, did Jes practice (from Ngondro and up) a full Dzogchen cycle, like for example the Kunzang Tuktik, from the Chokling Tersar?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. (Not a student of his, just know that he didn't practice anything like a ngondro).

heart said:

Hmm Malcolm, how do you know that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Because that is was I was told by one of his students, and that was also confirmed to me by another direct student of TU's who has there when Bertelsen was visting TU.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Who SHOULDN'T practice Vajrayana?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure why this topic even evokes any interest. The answer, as retro implied, is simple: "Anyone who is not interested". If someone is interested, than they should practice Vajrayana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Jes Bertelsen?

Content:

heart said:

A question for the students of Jes Bertelsen, did Jes practice (from Ngondro and up) a full Dzogchen cycle, like for example the Kunzang Tuktik, from the Chokling Tersar?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. (Not a student of his, just know that he didn't practice anything like a ngondro).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I don't put much faith in ordinary people, and the vast majority of Buddhists are ordinary people. Hence the bias.

Malcolm wrote:

So it seems misplaced to me that you would specifically single out Buddhists for bias.

Also, it must mean you are biased against yourself, since one presumes you regard yourself as an ordinary person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: When do you think the US will have a Buddhist president?

Content:
Luke said:
Yeah, but how else can we save Tibet?

Malcolm wrote:
We can't. Only the Chinese can save Tibet. And they don't seem very interested in that.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 8:43 PM
Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?
Content:

Indrajala said:
I have a slight personal bias against Buddhists in general.

Malcolm wrote:
Sad you have a bias against anyone.

Indrajala said:
Sadly I'm a fallible sinner like most men.

Malcolm wrote:
Seems a little strange to be biased against those whom one would consider your coreligionists. So why do you have a slight bias against Buddhists and what is it?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 10:49 AM
Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?
Content:

Indrajala said:
I have a slight personal bias against Buddhists in general.

Malcolm wrote:
Sad you have a bias against anyone.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 6:18 AM
Title: Re: When do you think the US will have a Buddhist president?
Content:
Luke said:

John F. Kennedy was the first Catholic President of the US, but how long do you think it will be before the US has its first Buddhist president?

And what do you think the pros and cons of the US having a Buddhist president would be?

Malcolm wrote:
he would be a lying politician like all the rest of them.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 4:17 AM
Title: Re: Who SHOULDN'T practice Vajrayana?
Content:
Luke said:
does one really need a guru to realize the nature of mind?

Malcolm wrote:
No, but it's faster.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 3:42 AM
Title: Re: Wikileaks for senate implodes!
Content:
conebeckham said:
I recall quickly glancing at a headline last week, purporting to state that Assange is actually espousing a Libertarian platform.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, he likes Rand Paul, apparently -- he and snowden.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 2:58 AM
Title: Re: Who SHOULDN'T practice Vajrayana?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
It makes you wonder if the secrecy advocated in the Buddhist tantras is not so much about being secret as it is "Hey guys, this Hindu yoga stuff is freaking awesome, but if our Buddhist compatriots get wind of how effective this stuff is a) they won't believe us b) they will consider us heretics no matter how much we insist our view is grounded in Buddhadharma".

Astus said:

And that gives another group of who shouldn't practice Vajrayana. Those who don't believe in ("transcendent") energy and related ideas.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, to put it more simply -- people who do not believe in Ayurvedic anatomy and physiology, even that which is discussed in various Mahāyāna sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?

Content:

Adamantine said:

When you contrast that with Aeons of diligent practice to get any substantial result which the other expressions of Buddhism propose, is there any wonder that in a culture of speed and instant coffee that we would gravitate towards the faster paths?

Malcolm wrote:

As a Bonpo Dzogchen logic text puts it -- effortless buddhahood is a desiderata.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

It is about time you started offering some citations in defense of your novel presentation of Tsongkhapa's views.

I've just moved and downsized my library. The Gelug section took a big hit as I'm not a Gelug student. However I did keep "Teachings on Je Tshongkhapa's Three Principal Aspects of the Path." with a commentary by HHDL.

Tsongkhapa's root text on pg. 43:

Appearances are infallible dependent arings:

Emptiness is free of assertions.

A long as these two understating (sic) are seen as separate,

One has not yet realised the intent of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Here is an alternate translation with the comments of Geshe Sonam Rinchen:

"So long as the understanding of appearances As unfailing dependent arising and of emptiness Free from all assertions seem disparate, You still do not comprehend the

Subduer's thought."

The understanding of the dependently arising and unfailing way in which causes and conditions produce their effects is a cognition of conventional reality, while the understanding that everything is empty of true existence is a cognition of the ultimate mode in which things exist. The way in which these two understandings apprehend their objects differs. So long as they seem incompatible and your understanding of a thing's dependently arising nature appears to undermine your understanding of its emptiness of true existence and vice versa, you still have not gained insight into what the Buddha intended to reveal nor have you found the correct view of the Middle Way. This is an indication that you must continue to persevere."

Geshe Sonam Rinchen. *The Three Principal Aspects of the Path* (Kindle Locations 1283-1287). Kindle Edition.

He continues to explain:

In the eleventh verse he mentions emptiness "free from all assertions." In the twelfth verse he refers to an understanding which "destroys through certainty the way the object is perceived." These phrases may be variously interpreted. "The mainstay of misconceptions" is generally viewed as true existence itself." The qualification of emptiness as being "free from all assertions" may be taken to mean that words cannot describe emptiness as it is. It can also refer to emptiness free from any assertions of intrinsic existence. Some early masters in Tibet, who subscribed to the Madhyamika view that everything is empty of inherent existence, found it difficult to posit conventional existence. They contended that since all phenomena are empty, they cannot be specified as this or that, as either existent or non-existent, and that proponents of the Middle Way hold no position, since they propound emptiness free from all assertions.

Geshe Sonam Rinchen. *The Three Principal Aspects of the Path* (Kindle Locations 1295-1300). Kindle Edition.

Here, Geshe Sonam Rinchen clearly differentiates the view you attribute to the Gelugpas from the actual Gelug view with this statement "Some early masters in Tibet, who subscribed to the Madhyamika view that everything is empty of inherent existence, found it difficult to posit conventional existence. They contended that since all phenomena are empty, they cannot be specified as this or that, as either existent or non-existent, and that proponents of the Middle Way hold no position, since they propound emptiness free from all assertions."

But this statement is not the Gelug view. The Gelug view is that emptiness is the mere absence of true existence i.e. "the understanding that everything is empty of true existence is a cognition of the ultimate mode in which things exist." Further, the Gelugpas claim that not only is this a view, it is the Prasangika view. The Gelugpas never claim that Prasangikas do not have a view. Quite the opposite in fact.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

To disagree with that statement you would have to take the position of a non-Gelug criticism that says they actually do have a view. Their position is that they do not, that their non-affirming negation is an absence of views.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so, the Gelugs assert that Candrakirti does have a view, in contradistinction with the earlier Tibetan presentation of Prasangika which holds that Prasangikas have no views of their own.

SMCJ, with all due respect, you are very confused about what the Gelug point of view actually is. You have completely confused it, utterly, with the view of their opponents.

It is about time you started offering some citations in defense of your novel presentation of Tsongkhapa's views.

The only thing I can imagine is that your Geshe is a renegade with the Gelugpa school, someone who has decided to follow Ganden Chopel's perspective. But Ganden Chopel's views and those of Tsongkhapa are at complete odds with each other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 23rd, 2013 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

ngodrup said:

Lhodrak (aka Drubchen) Namkha Gyaltsen (1326-1401) Mahasiddha and Dzogchen maser.

Malcolm wrote:

This was hardly Tsongkhapa's most important guru. Can you name even a single practice passed down in Gelug from this master? This master is mainly significant for Nyingmapas because on the series of questions Lhodrak validates Dzogchen for Tsongkhapa. But Tsongkhapa was not a Dzogchen practitioner.

Arguably, Tsongkhapa's most important Guru would be been Lama Umapa (Kadampa)(, from whom Tsongkhapa received the short lineage of Vajrabhairava, as well as many instructions from Manjushri. Other important masters would have been Lama Dampa Sonam Gyaltsen (Sakya), from whom Tsongkhapa received Cakrasamvara and Rendawa Shonu Lodo (Sakya) from whom he received Guhyasamaja. He also received the

transmission of Guhyasamaja and Cakrasamvara as well as Naro Chos drug from Drikung.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Who SHOULDN'T practice Vajrayana?

Content:

yegyal said:

People who have no trust in the teachings. People unwilling to, or incapable of, following a qualified teacher. People who can't keep a promise or a secret.

Simon E. said:

This.:

Hickersonia said:

Perhaps then this could be amended to include: "People who believe that the teachings were never intended to be secret at all."

Not trying to start an argument -- just adding another qualifier that might answer the original prompt.

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is, most of the things that in Vajrayāna which are secret (cakras, nadis, vāyus, asanas, bandhas, praṇāyamas, mantras, agnihotra, mandalas, abhisheka etc.) have been practiced and taught openly for millennia by Hindus.

It makes you wonder if the secrecy advocated in the Buddhist tantras is not so much about being secret as it is "Hey guys, this Hindu yoga stuff is freaking awesome, but if our Buddhist compatriots get wind of how effective this stuff is a) they won't believe us b) they will consider us heretics no matter how much we insist our view is grounded in Buddhadharma".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

ngodrup said:

Lama Tsongkhapa's main tantric guru was Nyingma...

smcj said:

I'm not 100% on my history, but that doesn't sound right. Lama Tsongkhapa had his students practice the Mahamudra and later translation practices. He got them from the Kagyus I believe. I know of no Nyingma practices in the Gelug school, although there may be some.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa's main project was to unify the three tantras, Guhyasamaja, Cakrasamvara and Vajrabhairava into a cohesive practice, centered around the exegesis of the Guhyasamaja Tantra as the most important of all these tantras.

Tsongkhapa has not single work in his corpus devoted to Mahāmudra alone.

Gelug Mahāmudra was developed many centuries later by the First Panchen Lama.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

ngodrup said:

Lama Tsongkhapa's main tantric guru was Nyingma

Malcolm wrote:

??? Who was that?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

The Gelug approach is to logically prove that the way things abide cannot be put into a logical proposition.

Malcolm wrote:

Not according to any Gelugpa teaching I have ever read.

smcj said:

The "non-affirming negation" negates, or disproves, what? It negates/disproves that things:

1. Actually exist.
2. Don't exist.
3. Both exist and don't exist.
4. Neither exist or don't exist.

Those are the four logical possibilities. There are no other logical possibilities. All four have been disproven, negated, rejected. Nothing else is offered as an alternative--ever!.

This is Gelug 101. How do you not see that my statement is the fundamental position of

the Gelug school? How can there be any other interpretation? If you think that the Gelug school asserts a logical proposition that explains the way things abide, I'd love to hear it.

Malcolm wrote:

Gelug 101: "does not exist in the ultimate, does not exist in the relative". Tsongkhapa explicitly rejects the analysis of three and four in your list because according to him they are merely double negations.

What you have presented is the non-Gelugpa presentation of freedom from four extremes, which is explicitly rejected by Tsongkhapa in Lamrim Chenmo and elsewhere as being incorrect. Tsongkhapa only rejects inherent existence, the subtle object of negation -- he never advocates rejecting existence, the coarse object of negation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

The Gelug approach is to logically prove that the way things abide cannot be put into a logical proposition.

Malcolm wrote:

Not according to any Gelugpa teaching I have ever read.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

That is what I was told in a private interview with my Gelug mentor.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there are various strains of Gelug thinking. But in general Gelugpas strenuously defend the idea that the intellectual exercise of identifying the object of negation, non-affirming negation, the emptiness of true existence in things, the negation of inherent existence resembles the actual realization of emptiness, is it is appropriate to be maintained conceptually. Granted, the Gelugpas also wish to go beyond mind, but they spend a lot of time defending and insisting that one needs to have a perfect Madhyamaka view before moving on the Vajrayāna, and insist that one needs to continue to cultivate that view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

It is famously "the non-affirming negation", which is an absence of intellectual view.

Malcolm wrote:

The Gelug treatment of a the non-affirming negation is absolutely an intellectual view -- that is what Gorampa, Mipham and others give them so much shit about.

smcj said:

The entire purpose of the geshe program is to bring the intellect fully to Dharma so it it sees, on its own terms, that the intellect cannot conceive of emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a total misread of the Gelug project.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 22nd, 2013 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

...since your intellectual views are pretty irrelevant if you are a Dzogchen practitioner, or even a Vajrayana practitioner.

This is an important point that often gets lost.

conebeckham said:

Agree, with the proviso that I'm not sure mainstream Gelukpas would.....

Malcolm wrote:

Mainstream Gelugs would absolutely not agree, since they subordinate Vajrayāna view to sutrayāna view -- which is the over all trend among Tibetan intellectuals since the time of Sakya Pandita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 21st, 2013 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

smcj said:

The Nyingmas call Shentong "Great Mad1yamaka".

Malcolm wrote:

The first person to use this term in Tibet was Kawa Paltseg. He uses the term dbu ma chen po to refer to spros bral, freedom from extremes. His presentation of Madhyamaka

bears no observable commonalities with gzhan stong.

The Sakyapas follow Kawa Paltseg's point of view, and refer to their Madhyamaka as great Madhyamaka also. The Gelugpas also refer to Lama Tsongkhapa's point of view as Great Madhyamaka.

So basically, everyone in Tibet refers to their preferred system of Madhyamaka as "great".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 21st, 2013 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Views of Shentong and Dolpopa

Content:

Vidyaraja said:

Outside of the Jonang school, what are the views of the other schools in regards to the Shentong position and the works/thought of Dolpopa, particularly the Nyingma and Kagyu? Is it possible to be part of these schools while maintaining a personal Shentong view or is there a dogmatism that members must follow? Can one practice Dzogchen while maintaining Dolpopa's viewpoint on the Absolute and are there any prominent figures who have done so?

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

Strains of gzhan stong exist in Sakya, Kagyu and Nyingma.

gZhan stong is fundamentally a new mantra (sngags gsar ma) school position, having arrived to Tibet with the 11th century translator, Yumo Mikyo Dorje, as a oral instruction related to Kalacakra. So from that point of view, gzhan stong and Dzogchen are historically unrelated.

gZhan stong, along with the Jonang tradition of Kalacakra, was imported into the Kagyu via a 17th century Nyingma Lama named Rigzin Tsewang, who was the root guru of the Karma Kagyu Lama, Situ Panchen. Situ Panchen was originally disinterested in gzhan stong, so the story goes, but because his view was a bit nihilistic, Rigzin Tsewang advised Situ Panchen to adopt the gzhan stong view in order to extend his life. After that, gzhan stong view spread widely among Karma Kagyu in Eastern Tibet. However, the lineage did not widely spread amongst the Nyingma school itself until the time of Khyentse and Kongtrul. Because Kongtrul was such a strong exponent of gzhan stong, many Kagyus and Nyingmapas adopted gzhan stong as their own view. However, as far as Nyingma goes, just as many did not. Presently, Nyingmapas are evenly divided more or less between those who follow the "freedom from extremes" Madhyamaka position set forth by Kawa Paltseg in the early 9th century and neo-gzhan stong as presented by Kongtrul.

In general, since the madhyamaka system of the two truths is incompatible with

Dzogchen, what need to mention the Yogacara system of three natures? However, just as a person can maintain a sutrayāna view of Gelug prasangika (for example, Jigme Lingpa) and still be a Dzogchen practitioner, one can also maintain the view of gzhan stong and be a Dzogchen practitioner -- since your intellectual views are pretty irrelevant if you are a Dzogchen practitioner, or even a Vajrayana practitioner. The standard early Nyingma view (i.e. Rongzom, Rogben, etc.) is that the view of tantra in general and Dzogchen in particular is higher than that of madhyamaka in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 21st, 2013 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: 'Buddhist' forms of alternative medicine?

Content:

dyanaprajna2011 said:

Are there any Buddhist forms of alternative medicine? I know groups such as Chinese medicine and Tibetan medicine have Buddhist influences, but are there any based solely, or at least mostly, on Buddhist philosophy?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Medicine is philosophically based solely on Buddhadharma. In other words, the remote cause of all disease is the ignorance that grasps self. The approximate cause is the three afflictions, desire, hatred and ignorance. The immediate cause is the three doṣas, vatta, pitta, and kapha.

The basis for Tibetan Medicine is Buddhist sutra and tantra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 20th, 2013 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhist Take on What Is and Isn't Knowable

Content:

Matt J said:

I have not seen a similar Buddhist classification. Not to say there isn't one, but I haven't come across it.

Malcolm wrote:

There isn't. Buddhadharma accepts only three authorities, the ones I've listed above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 20th, 2013 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: How to develop devotion to a deity?

Content:

philji said:

In our meditation group we have just started song a mantra and visualization practice of Green Tara. one of the group tells me he feels no devotion and thinks it is all fabricated... I am wondering what advice to give.....how to develop devotion? What to do if you have none? Many thanks...

Malcolm wrote:

In order to have devotion to a practice, you need to have devotion to the master from whom you received it. If you feel no devotion towards that master, then how can you be expected to have devotion towards a given practice?

Perhaps this person would prefer to practice śamatha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 18th, 2013 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

brendan said:

So if the Taliban community or the US military complex community(don't mean to single out the Taliban or the US) at this moment were to receive a transmission of Vajrasattva providing all the cognitions were correct. Why would the process of purification commence?

Malcolm wrote:

Because it is assumed that someone who receives transmission is interested in the path shown by Vajrasattva, Vajradhara and so on.

brendan said:

Why is so much co-emergence required from the other side considering the apparent attributes of Vajrasattva?

The "great vehicle" Buddhahood seems in complete.

Cessation of suffering from a "Great Vehicle" view has only occurred on paper.

Malcolm wrote:

What does the Buddhahood of Mahāyāna lack? And why do you assert it has never been realized?

From what source do you derive your seemingly authoritative pronouncements?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 18th, 2013 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: What school of Buddhism do you follow?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

you forgot to add "no school"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 17th, 2013 at 6:58 AM

Title: Re: Psychedelics

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Some relevant quotes:

Malcolm wrote:

According to Garab Dorje, the purpose of using hallucinogens is to see that the mind is malleable, not a fixed or permanent substance. So, in fact hallucinogens do have a use in Dharma, albeit an extremely limited and narrow one.

tomamundsen said:

Any idea which text this comes from? What hallucinogens would they have been using in Oddiyana? Datura?

Malcolm wrote:

It is in the Vlma Nyinthig, and yes, the plant mentioned is datura. Also Datura was used in India for Mahakala initiations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

lama tsewang said:

is the book by sonam tsemo, the book translator as yoginis eye??

tsewang

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. However the title is incorrect. There is no mention of a yogini's eye anywhere in the

text.

I have also translated this text, but it is still in editing mode.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

Konchog1 said:

While we're on the topic...Why did Pabhongkha like Vajrayogini so much? Considering him, I would assume he would have been a strict 'Tsongkhapa's three' purist.

(Everyone, let's please not make this one of those threads)

Malcolm wrote:

Pabhongkha, when he was younger, had a close relationship with one of the Zimog Tulkus of Nalendra Phenpo, from whom he received most of the Sakya traditions he favored (such as four faced Mahākala, and so on).

Apparently (since I have not actually read his bio), he had a vision of Vajrayogini who encouraged him to merge the stream of Naro Khachö teachings with the view of Tsongkhapa.

In one sense, Yogini was an ideal practice for this -- it (unlike Lamdre) does not have any extensive instructions of view on its own, being purely a practice cycle. So in Sakya, Yogini is practiced in the broader context of the Lamdre view. One common approach is that Hevajra is used for working on creation stage, and Yogini for completion stage.

Secondly, Pabhongkha was a specialist in Cakrasamvara, and Yogini is the essence of Cakrasamvara practice. If one practices Yogini, the entire Cakrasamvara mandala is included.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: Je Rinpoche on Guhyasamāja tantra

Content:

Will said:

In 2010 Robert Thurman headed up a translation of the Five Stages commentary by Je Rinpoche. Then in March of 2013 Gavin Kilty came out with another translation.

Any students or practitioners who have compared the two? If yes, what are the differences between the two versions?

No, I am not going to practice or suggest others practice based on a book; just wondering about accuracy & quality of the two translations.

Malcolm wrote:
Kilty's is better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 8:00 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Thanks Malcolm this is interesting information, I will definitely follow up. If HHST gives it in India it might be possible, but in Europe I have to work most weekends so it is more difficult. rgyud sde spyi rnam is definitely something I will look into. Can I get the text online or should I ask a friend of mine at Dzongsar Shedra to send it?

Malcolm wrote:

rgyud sde spyi rnam (Sonam Tsemo):

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG03981\\$W22271](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG03981$W22271)

rin po che ljon shing (Dragpa Gyaltsen):

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04025\\$W22271](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04025$W22271)

These two texts are like the sun and the moon of Sakya view and practice. If you read these, you will understand very perfectly the point of view of the Sakyapa school on everything from sutra to tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I would happily take a Sakya Vajrayogini initiation if the opportunity arose from HHST or Jetsun Kushok-la. The thing is, though, I am not sure if the Sakya ngondro and things would be required before taking this.

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakyapas would not require you to complete ngondro before receiving this transmission.

JKhedrup said:

I was just surprised that Lama Migmar reacted to the question. I was very curious, and wanted to ask, but was half expecting a "Ah Yes the Gelugs co-opted one of our treasured inner practices bit", so his open response was a pleasant surprise.

Malcolm wrote:

Lama Migmar (Khenpo, actually) is a great proponent of Vajrayogini as well as Tara. He feels that Vajrayogini is the ideal practice for this day and age, and as such, approves of its wide spread amongst Gelug, and anywhere else for that matter.

JKhedrup said:

He actually said there were some interesting commentaries in the Gelug tradition, though of course, that the Sakyas "held the complete lineage with uncommon instructions etc." (paraphrasing as this was awhile ago).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact the most detailed commentary on the practice was composed by a Geshe who happened to be a disciple of Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo.

The fact of the matter however is that the Yogini practice is elaborated based on the Sakyapa understanding of tantra, and so therefore, reading such texts as rgyud sde spyi rnam and so on will assist in how one understands the practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 16th, 2013 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

JKhedrup said:

When I met Lama Migmar in Europe and asked him this question he did say the Gelug Vajrayogini incorporated some longer elements in the offering section and different word choices in other parts of the sadhana, but that he felt there were no major, significant differences. I was a little surprised because I heard several Sakya lamas were not so happy with their VY practice being co-opted and popularized so widely by Gelug Lamas. (Lama Migmar is a scholar and teacher in the Sakya tradition).

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, the pre-Pabhongkha tradition of VY is unchanged from the Sakya presentation. But Pabhongkha made a number of changes to the tradition based on his own intellectual ideas of how the practice should be brought into line with the broader Cakrasamvara tradition.

Since Pabhongkha made fundamental changes to the tradition, Sakya lineage masters will not bestow the uncommon Vajrayogini instructions on someone who has only received the tradition from Pabhongkha lineage. They [meaning HH Sakya Trizin, Jetsun Kusho and others] will require you to receive both a two-day empowerment in Hevajra or Cakrasamvara as well as Vajrayogini blessing from a major Sakya lineage holder as a

prerequisite even if you have received these in Gelug.

Also, HH Dalai Lama is not fond of the fact that Vajrayogini has eclipsed more traditional Gelug practices and has stated this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: Bodong Tradition

Content:

Dorje Shedrub said:

I never heard of this tradition until today when I was reading an intro to a tantra. Elsewhere I read that it is a branch from the Sakya tradition.

Does anyone have more information? Thanks

DS

Malcolm wrote:

The Bodong tradition stems from Bodong Panchen Chogley Namgyal. He was an amazing polymath whose collected works form 108 volumes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism beyond the nation state

Content:

Sherlock said:

ChNN doesn't really find the term lamaism very offensive.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but the manner on which it was used by Waddell and others suggests degeneration and backwardness -- hardly the actual state of Buddhism in Tibet at the time, when there were bhiṣsus holding the strictest vinaya, great meditators everywhere, and panditas in all the monasteries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhist Take on What Is and Isn't Knowable

Content:

plwk said:

Pratyakṣa — direct sense perception

Anumāna — logical inference

Śabda — verbal testimony

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhadharma, all three of these are regarded as pramāṇas, i.e., authorities.
Realization of ultimate truth is considered yogic pratyakṣa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism beyond the nation state

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I can only speak for the gelug tradition with which i am familiar, but at least a majority were exposed to the texts in the first few years, and were able to read them at least. But yes, many did not finish their education or worked.

Indrajala said:

Regardless of how we feel about it now in 2013, at the time it would have understandably seemed warranted to have a different term for the religion in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I suppose so, given that one was likely to be an ignorant western barbarian with no civilization and manners at that time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 15th, 2013 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism beyond the nation state

Content:

Indrajala said:

For example in the case of "Tibetan Buddhism":

David Gray (University of Santa Clara) questions the category Tibetan Buddhism. In his essay "How Tibetan is Tibetan Buddhism? On the Applicability of a National Designation for a Transnational Tradition," he points out that today there is no Tibet to which this label can refer. Additionally, arguably the majority of practitioners of "Tibetan" Buddhism neither are ethnic Tibetans, nor do they speak or read Tibetan. More significantly, while Tibetans considered themselves Buddhists and had a sense of Tibet as a distinct geo-political category, "they simply did not conceive of their tradition in nationalistic terms."

What comes to mind here is how contemporary Tibetan Buddhism in the west is often intricately linked with Tibetan nationalism, going hand in hand with the Tibetan independence movement.

Malcolm wrote:

Presently, Buddhism has become a nationalist banner for young Tibetans inside of Tibet, so Gray is mistaken. In fact, under the Chinese hegemony, Buddhism, especially the Nyingma school, has become widely identified with the struggle for Tibetan independence in large part because Nyingma legends are based on the Tibetan Imperial Period -- and in coordination with that is a very popular cult of Gesar as guru, deva and dharmapāla.

As for westerners who use the sobriquet "Tibetan Buddhism", this is not really nationalistic -- it is connected with the source of the brand i.e. Tibet, as opposed to Japanese Buddhism (Zen, Shingon, Tendai, Nichiren), etc., or Chinese Buddhism (Chan, Pure Land, etc.).

Many westerners adopt the styles, customs and costumes of the nation their Buddhism derives from: for example, in Zen, Chan, Son, Theravada, Sakya, Kagyu, Nyingma, Gelug etc. They even adopt the individual customs of different sects.

But this adoption and adaptation is largely free from political overtones. For example, I am sure no western practitioner of Zen really takes the ultra nationalist positions of their Japanese forbears.

In fact, what I think you are witnessing is merely a phase in adaptation of a regional Buddhist teaching which can be grouped into three rough phases: curiosity; exploration and adoption; maturation and evolution beyond that cultural source of a given teaching.

Some Tibetans, like Trungpa, tried to build cultural separation from the source culture of his teachings right from the beginning. Most of the Shambhala Buddhists I know are only very dimly aware of Tibet and really do not care much about it. They are not encouraged to learn Tibetan and they are actively discouraged from having direct contact with Tibetan teachers.

Other Tibetans, like Chagdud, Lama Dawa, etc., are very interested in having their students preserve the uniquely Tibetan forms of the Nyingma school.

Some other Tibetans, like Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, assert their Dharma teachings is beyond cultural limitations, etc., but maintain separate organizations for the academic study and preservation of aspects of Tibetan cultural knowledge such as medicine, astrology, etc.

So the stereotype you paint here is rather limited and feeble. The forms of Dharma that come from Tibet have been in the West long enough so that now various different organizations are starting to stand on their own without much support from Tibetan institutions.

In general, those organizations most tied into Tibetan culture are the Gelugs and the Kagyus because they funnel large amounts of money from Taiwan, Europe and the US to monasteries in India.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 14th, 2013 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Is Buddhist cosmology essentially Vedic?

Content:

retrofuturist said:

Greetings,

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty hard to square this opinion with the Buddha's recognition that the Gayatri Mantra is the supreme among mantras (tat savitur...etc.) in the Pali Canon.

retrofuturist said:

Do you have a credible source for this? I very much doubt this is "in the Pali Canon"...

Maitri,

Retro.

Malcolm wrote:

It is there, but I cannot recall where. It is not an advocacy of doing the mantra, it is in a list of "greats". Likewise, the Buddha charges Ananda with requesting knowledgeable and faithful kṣatriyas, brahmins and householders to carry out his funeral rites.

What the Buddha rejected was the purva-mimamsa view of liberation through rites and rituals. But he did not reject Vedic culture completely, as witnessed in his advice to Vajjians to maintain their ancestral practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 14th, 2013 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Buddhist cosmology essentially Vedic?

Content:

Indrajala said:

Even in early Buddhism, anything that seems Vedic might actually just be cause of common Indo-European heritage. At the time you had Indo-Europeans, who were not necessarily people of the Vedas, settled all around north India and Central Asia.

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty hard to square this opinion with the Buddha's recognition that the Gayatri Mantra is the supreme among mantras (tat savitur...etc.) in the Pali Canon.

Buddhism is filled with Vedic ideas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 13th, 2013 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Lineage connected to Vairocana ?

Content:

heart said:

Never ending new website this man manage to create

The teachings of Vairocana is contained in the Nyingma Kama teachings.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

And taught completely by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 12th, 2013 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sakya & Gelug Vajrayogini

Content:

Kunzang8 said:

Hi

What are the differences between the Sakya and Gelug lineages of VY? I understand that the Gelug VY originally came from Sakya but I heard there are differences in the practice itself. Within the limits of what can be discussed in a public forum could someone please explain to me what the main differences in practice between the two lineages? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

The Gelug form has differences in how the guru yoga is performed (it is more elaborate), how the offerings are made, how the mantra is visualized, and so on. Primarily the Gelug form merely makes the sadhana practice more elaborate.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 10th, 2013 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Mahavairocana empowerment applicability

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In the Tibetan tradition...

Indrajala said:

Fair enough, but the texts I've looked at themselves don't mention these things, which from a scholarly point of view makes me wonder how much was added on top of them after they were translated. The content might remain static, but the expectations and conditions associated with a given text or practice seem often to have been multiplied and amplified. This isn't wrong, but just makes you wonder if the model of 2013 accurately reflects what they were doing in the 9th century.

Malcolm wrote:

Indian tantric texts themselves this give triad of teachings, so it is not some invention of Tibetans. If your goal is adherence to some Indian idea of tantric practice, then your best bet is to become educated in the Sakya school's tradition. Four of the five founding masters of Sakya were conversationally fluent in Sanskrit and studied with the great Indian pandits of their day who came to Tibet. As far as the Sakya school is concerned, its early textual tradition is a direct import of 10th/11th century Indian Buddhist tantrism and its procedures and values. Granted, the Sakya school's practices underwent consolidation and streamlining, but is in general very faithful to how things were being done in India during the 10th and 11th century, especially in lower tantra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 10th, 2013 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Mahavairocana empowerment applicability

Content:

Indrajala said:

If you're referring to oral instructions that are passed down from generation to generation, I'm sceptical these instructions would actually reflect the original practice and oral commentary, supposing such a thing existed apart from the text from the start. Things change in transmission and translation.

Malcolm wrote:

In the Tibetan tradition, there are two levels when it comes to tantra -- the ripening empowerment and the liberating instruction. You are not really qualified to practice sadhana without instruction i.e. the liberating instruction. Beyond this, upadeshas are necessary, which define the key points of practice that arise from the experience of realized masters in the lineage. So generally, to be fully equipped to practice in a given Indo-Tibetan practice lineage such as Lamdre, Naro Khachod, etc., (no matter what school) or even Yogatantra such as Sarvavidyā, you need three things: empowerment, instructions and upadeshas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 9th, 2013 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: Mahavairocana empowerment applicability

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Theoretically, but not necessarily, because the explanation and instruction lineage is completely different. Also the method of conferring the initiation might be quite different.

Indrajala said:

Someone suggested that it is like the Kalacakra empowerment in that if you receive it you can study and practice anything related to Kalacakra. So, theoretically, it should be possible. It just seems rather unorthodox, but not necessarily wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

That is also not necessarily the case. For example, even you have received a general Kalacakra empowerment, you are not necessarily permitted to receive teachings on the Sadāṅgayoga teachings. Why? Because there are many levels of Kalacakra empowerments, outer, inner, secret, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 9th, 2013 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Mahavairocana empowerment applicability

Content:

Indrajala said:

If someone had received the full Mahavairocana empowerment (yoga-tantra) from a Tibetan master, would that entitle them to study and practice the Mahavairocana-associated materials as found in Tang Vajrayana (i.e., Shingon)?

This seems a bit ambiguous because all the traditions are supposed to have the same source, and the empowerment in Tibetan Buddhism ultimately covers all Mahavairocana associated practices, of which the Shingon ones would have to be included, no?

Malcolm wrote:

Theoretically, but not necessarily, because the explanation and instruction lineage is completely different. Also the method of conferring the initiation might be quite different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 8th, 2013 at 9:34 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

smcj said:

One basic idea in Dharma is that nothing exists in the way we normally assume things to

exist-- including ourselves! My teacher used to emphasize that when I listened to teachings on emptiness I should remember that they were a description of how I actually abide.

Is there anyone here that thinks a description of how yidam abide wouldn't include some abstractions?

Malcolm wrote:

The personages whom yidams portray conventionally exist as sambhogakāya manifestations. Otherwise, there could be no method connected with them. Why? Because in the path of transformation the result is practiced as the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 7th, 2013 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Violence in late period Indian Buddhism

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Rechungpa, Padmasambhava, Virupa, and several of the Mahasiddha are described as killing tirthikas. It's unnecessary to sift through metaphors to find such examples.

Malcolm wrote:

sources?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 3rd, 2013 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, archetypes as used by Dahl is a Jungian term, not really to be conflated with Platonic usages of the term at all. Buddhism in all its forms is strictly nominalist, and rejects all universals (samanya-artha) as being unreal abstractions.

Yidams are sambhogakāya emanations, not archetypes.

gregkavarnos said:

Fair enough. Leads me to ask the question as to what is better: to allow a practitioner to consider Yidams as archetypes and to practice according to that interpretation or is it better to remain locked into a formal (correct) interpretation which may cause the practitioner (due to their karmic preponderances) to abandon practices and lose faith in the teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

Considering yidams as "archetypes" will not lead to a correct result. Why? At one level

yidams are paths that represent the mandala of the basis, the mandala of the path, and the mandala of the result. At another level, yidams are sambhogakāya forms i.e. the form in which a sambhogakāya appeared in order to transmit the method of the path of transformation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 2nd, 2013 at 1:49 PM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

yegyal said:

So Cort's explanation is exactly what I'm talking about. The way he is explaining is one way of looking at it, but it's not the only one.

Malcolm wrote:

It's actually total nonsense. The idea of "archetypes" comes from Jung, and is completely foreign to Buddhadharma.

gregkavarnos said:

The idea or concept of archetypes (αρχέτυπα) predates Jung by a few thousand years. Jung was the first modern theorist to use the term systematically. The term actually originates from Plato's Theory of Forms. So the concept wouldn't have been alien to ancient Buddhist philosophers. I don't know if they would have agreed with it too much though.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, archetypes as used by Dahl is a Jungian term, not really to be conflated with with Platonic usages of the term at all. Buddhism in all its forms is strictly nominalist, and rejects all universals (samanya-artha) as being unreal abstractions.

Yidams are sambhogakāya emanations, not archetypes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 2nd, 2013 at 12:41 PM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

yegyal said:

So Cort's explanation is exactly what I'm talking about. The way he is explaining is one way of looking at it, but it's not the only one.

Malcolm wrote:

It's actually total nonsense. The idea of "archetypes" comes from Jung, and is

completely foreign to Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 31st, 2013 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Kunjed Gyalpo:The Supreme Source

Content:

mutasuk said:

Jim Valby knows and understands what he translates.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 30th, 2013 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

smcj said:

It's like asking, "who wrote the Uttaratantra"?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. There are texts attributed directly to Garab Dorje, and there are the tantras which are considered to have been revealed by him, which were taught by various past Buddhas such as Shonnu Pawo Tobdan, Vajrasattva and so on.

To answer the question, in the east there is the pure buddhafield of Nirmanakāya Vajrasattva.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 29th, 2013 at 11:26 AM

Title: Re: Does Vajrasattva exist?

Content:

smcj said:

Even though it is not in the purview of the thread, I'd like to say that Vajrasattva is very important and not just a confession practice.

Garab Dorje created Dzogchen from doing Vajrasattva practice. I guess innate purity=perfection.

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje in no sense "created" Dzogchen. Garab Dorje is the Nirmanakāya emanation of Vajrasattva (Sambhogakāya).

Dzogchen, according to its own texts and traditions is the original Dharma teaching from which all other so called "Buddhist" and "non-Buddhist" Dharma teachings arise.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 23rd, 2013 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Translation requested for Tibetan name

Content:

Jinzang said:

Display of Changeless Merit. The last word (rtsal) is difficult to translate and others might argue over it. The first two, merit (bsod nams) and changeless ('gyur med) are standard.

Malcolm wrote:

rtsal = vega = powerful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 20th, 2013 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Greg said:

Is one list mistaken, or are these two different things?

Malcolm wrote:

The list of the four contemplations (ting nge 'dzin) is the more accurate list. But the other list also is correct, though it is from the point of view of the meaning of gnas pa and mi gyo ba.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 20th, 2013 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, Gampopa started out as a Nyingmapa, then became a Kadampa monk, then met Milarepa towards the end of the latter's life.

smcj said:

Where did you hear he started out as a Nyingmapa? I thought his entry into Dharma was

because his dying wife asked him not to marry again, thus his becoming a Kadampa monk.

Malcolm wrote:

He was a doctor before he was a monk. And most people in Tibet at that time were Nyingmapas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 1:41 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I guess your experience and observations differ? I doubt it!

Malcolm wrote:

Quite different, but then I am not a textual fundamentalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 12:32 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

He says "on occasion", not every day at every meal. Moreover, most of this is explained with medical purposes, not daily behavior. His testament to the Ngakpas remain full of sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you began by saying that alcohol was poison that destroyed the channels -- but in fact as we see, that is false -- alcohol can be quite good for the channels.

Secondly, while I don't have a drink with every meal, far from it, I still maintain that it is no problem to have a glass of wine with dinner, especially if it is good quality, properly and carefully made wine. No one, apart from someone with a medical condition, gets intoxicated from a glass of wine with dinner and the health benefits are well documented.

Of course, in the eighth century, and in places like China today, alcohol was an appalling travesty -- it is all rot gut. There is no good quality alcohol anywhere outside of the important wine growing regions of the world and their markets.

Tibetan chang is an exception, because it is rarely is more than 2 percent alcohol and is

quite weak. Arak is a different story.

In short, there is a lot of alcohol such as whiskey and so on that can be quite harmful to one's health. But wine and beer in moderation is not a problem (which is all I have been saying) for most people, in general.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If not, then there is no problem using any of these things.

mutsuk said:

No, there is a problem with alcohol indeed in itself.

Malcolm wrote:

He also wrote in the dgongs pa zang thal:

There is no fault if on occasion
one administers yogurt, good alcohol and milk.

and:

"After that, in order to enhance one's channels and vāyu, use good meat, good alcohol that is sweet and gentle, milk soups, butter, triphala medicinal ghee and pañcamula medicinal ghee."

But there are other occasions when he strongly recommends avoiding alcohol, for example, when doing rasāyana, etc. And indeed criticizes people for _heedlessly_ consuming meat and alcohol.

So the real point is one must work with circumstances and understand one's situation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But when we consider textual sources, for example, the late Dudjom Rinpoche writes very clearly in the Throma retreat manual that it is important to drink a small amount of

alcohol everyday for integration.

mutsuk said:

This is done in order to test one's integration of various circumstances including using intoxicants. Dudjom Rinpoche has also given a very lively portrait of people "calling themselves Dzogchenpas when their breath fetid with wine, their heavy bottom, their stinking odor, etc." (rDzogs chen ngo sprod skal bzang snying nor, bDud 'joms gsung 'bum, vol. 25, p. 341). This is in context of rDzogs chen instructions, not sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is no different than having a glass of wine with dinner. If you cannot integrate, you should not drink wine for dinner -- who ever said otherwise?

And yes, it is in the context of Dzogchen instructions, just like ChNN's point of view. As I said, I am not a sūtrayāna practitioner. What is appropriate for them is not appropriate necessarily for Vajrayāna practitioners.

If you are a person with a propensity for a problem with anything, be it food, alcohol, sex, etc., then one has to examine that. If not, then there is no problem using any of these things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

It is clear throughout all the pages of this thread that you definitely need to justify your usage.

Malcolm wrote:

Need to justify? No, not in any sense at all.

But when we consider textual sources, for example, the late Dudjom Rinpoche writes very clearly in the Throma retreat manual that it is important to drink a small amount of alcohol everyday for integration.

The Caraksamhita as well as the rgyud bzhi does not describe alcohol solely in terms of faults.

Longchenpa as we have seen praises the benefits of alcohol.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu explicitly teaches us in the DC that we need not consider ourselves constrained by pratimokṣa rules _at all_, and he is a person who benefits many people who regularly partakes of alcohol.

Finally, I am not sūtrayāna practitioner, so what is appropriate for such people is not appropriate for me in every case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, greg. It does not. Everthing in the world can be either poison or amrita -- it depends on the method.

From the ultimate perspective: yes! From the relative perspective: no! /quote]

Method means relative, that is the point of having a method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

the Buddha says : "A person who delights in drinking alcohol/ Cannot bring benefit to himself or happiness to others." (chang 'thung ba la mngon par dga' ba'i mi/ bdag la phan dang gzhan la bde mi nus/).

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what one means by "delights" -- I am pretty sure that a glass of wine with dinner is not included.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

For some people even a gulp of alcohol is harmful.

Malcolm wrote:

For other people, even a single peanut is fatal.

M

gregkavarnos said:

So what? I do not know of anybody that has died from peanut poisoning. I have a friend that suffers from the incapacity to metabolise alcohol. Nor do I know of anybody going on a weekend peanut binge. I personally know of two people that died due to the consequences of long term alcohol (over) consumption. I had another two friends go through detox programs and another one that detoxed on their own. I also personally know a couple of people that died in automobile and motorcycle accidents due to drink driving. I do not know of anybody that has crashed their car under the influence of peanuts. I know that after a couple of handfuls of peanuts I do not lose any awareness, I cannot say the same thing for what happens after a couple of beers. I guess that makes your example completely invalid then. Right?

Malcolm wrote:

No, greg. It does not. Everthing in the world can be either poison or amrita -- it depends on the method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutasuk said:

So yes, once and for all, it is a poison.

Malcolm wrote:

Total and complete nonsense.

mutasuk said:

Yeah sure, whatever Nyagla Pema Dūdül, and Shardza Rinpoche wrote is total nonsense. Can you imagine that your opinion might be of little value compared to their teachings ?

Malcolm wrote:

I can imagine that their views on the subject are not definitive.

"World! Do not doubt beer!"

-- Virupa

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 16th, 2013 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

For some people even a gulp of alcohol is harmful.

Malcolm wrote:

For other people, even a single peanut is fatal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 1:35 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

flavio81 said:

Yes. Frankly, it does not make sense. One should try to understand the underlying fundamentals of the teaching being followed instead of going the easy way of taking any tibetan scripture -disregarding its context- to support one's extreme views.

gregkavarnos said:

Why do you consider that saying "one should refrain from alcohol" is an extreme view and yet consider that saying "one should drink alcohol" is a moderate view? Is it just an attempt to invalidate the point being made by "mutsuk"? An attempt based merely on your personal/cultural preferences?

Alcohol, from a scientific/medical point of view is a poison.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, it is acetaldehyde that is the toxin produced by metabolizing ethanol, which is then further oxidized into harmless acetic acid by acetaldehyde dehydrogenase.

Thus if one drinks alcohol in moderation, there is no problem. It is only when one drinks in excess that alcohol is poisonous. But a glass or two of wine will not be harmful and has many benefits.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 11:11 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

So yes, once and for all, it is a poison.

Malcolm wrote:

Total and complete nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Alcohol is not a poison...

mutsuk said:

It is.

Malcolm wrote:

It isn't.

Read long chen pa's praise of the qualities of alcohol.

dri med 'od zer. " bdud rtsi zil mngar ma/." In gsung thor bu/_dri med 'od zer/(sde dge par ma/). TBRC W23504. 2: 332 - 335. paro, bhutan: lama ngodrup and sherab drimey, 1982.
[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00EGS1013837%7CO2CN67002CN87712CN91062CN91092CN91112CN91122CN91162CN91191PD121506\\$W23504](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00EGS1013837%7CO2CN67002CN87712CN91062CN91092CN91112CN91122CN91162CN91191PD121506$W23504)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

In a body, channels and winds are channels and winds, no matter if one is a monk, a yogi or someone doing nothing. The poison is doing the same ravages...

Malcolm wrote:

Alcohol is not a poison, unless it is misused, just like water.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 15th, 2013 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

kirtu said:

For most people on this path, a glass of wine or beer clearly isn't indulgence.

mutsuk said:

Well Shardza Rinpoche is of the opinion that alcohol affects channels and winds with irreversible results...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there are many opinions out there. And Shardza was after all a monk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

Yes that's exactly it! Thanks for reading with unbiased eyes ! What Sönam is trying to have people swallow is that: 1. there are no vows or samayas in Dzogchen, and 2. people who follow vows are of inferior capacities. This is misleading.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two different things here:

1) The textual system of Dzogchen in which there are samayas which much be maintained (actually some Dzogchen tantras state there are no samayas to maintain -- this point is addressed by Nyi 'bum in his tshig don bcu gcig).

2) The teachings of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu in which it is maintained that the principle of Dzogchen is not based on vows to follow. But of course even ChNN expects his students to follow samaya. But in his case, it is interesting because he has not (to my knowledge) detailed a specific list of vows nor has he bothered to say anything about samaya other than that we ought to strive to get along with each other, and not blabber secret teachings in public.

But this is all besides the point of thread -- the subject of which is why Śākyamuni Buddha felt compelled to prohibit alcohol.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood not being the end of the path

Content:

Sherlock said:

Then why are there general Mahayana aspirations about vowing not to achieve Buddhahood until all sentient beings are liberated etc?

Malcolm wrote:

There are three aspirations for buddhahood: king, captain and shepard. The aspiration you mention above is the shepard type -- it not the one commonly taught, for example, in Tibetan Buddhism.

In Tibetan Buddhism the king-like aspiration is taught, i.e. may I achieve complete buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings.

trevor said:

I can feel that I am the last sentient being in samsara and everyone else is a Buddha trying to make me realize.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, one can feel many things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 12:28 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

mutsuk said:

The respect of vows and necessity to hold them is affirmed in numerous Dzogchen Tantras, starting with the sGra-thal-'gyur. It is again a case of misunderstanding Dzogchen and the Dzogchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Among the 27 samayas mentioned by Longchenpa in the bla ma yang thig, avoiding alcohol is never mentioned.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood not being the end of the path

Content:

Sherlock said:

Then why are there general Mahayana aspirations about vowing not to achieve Buddhahood until all sentient beings are liberated etc?

Malcolm wrote:

There are three aspirations for buddhahood: king, captain and shepard. The aspiration you mention above is the shepard type -- it not the one commonly taught, for example, in Tibetan Buddhism.

In Tibetan Buddhism the king-like aspiration is taught, i.e. may I achieve complete buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood not being the end of the path

Content:

Sherlock said:

Correct me if I'm wrong, but In general Mahayana, the general idea seems to be that achieving Buddhahood will prevent one from further benefiting sentient beings

Malcolm wrote:

No. This idea is incorrect. The goal of Mahāyāna Buddhism is non-abiding nirvana in which a buddha always acts on behalf of sentient beings, as opposed to the hīnayāna concept of buddhahood in which a buddha ceases his activity at parinirvana.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 14th, 2013 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

5heaps said:

this should count as transformation as well...

Malcolm wrote:

But it does not as a matter of definition.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 13th, 2013 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Dan74"]

I fail to understand why his character needs to be put on trial and feel a bit odd peering into these 4-5 year-old exchanges./quote]

It speaks to his motives.

I don't disagree with what Snowden did, BTW. And I think the reaction by the US Gvt. is a bit over the top, but I also, from the beginning, have found something pretty off about the whole affair.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 13th, 2013 at 1:02 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As it turns out, Snowden is a right wing anti-Obama libertarian.

<http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2013/06/exclusive-in-2009-ed-snowden-said-leakers-should-be-shot-then-he-became-one/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 11th, 2013 at 11:53 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

5heaps said:

yes that is the result according to everyone except Tsongkhapa, but are liberation and the arya truths not considered purity? are the dissolution of a suffering persona and the arising of an identity beyond suffering not considered purities? by definition selflessness and these which accompany it are beyond samsara, thats why you used the word 'liberation'. so we can call them transformations, from the afflicted (samsara), to the non-afflicted (pure). what is wrong with that?

if you then move the scale from selflessness to emptiness, you now have fullblown buddhahood transformations.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no _path_ of transformation in common Mahāyāna. The method of common Mahāyāna is called the six pāramitās.

Phenomena remain afflictive even for ārya bodhisattvas until they reach the pure bhumis (8-10). After this point, Bodhisattvas only take rebirth in the so called pure abodes, but this takes two incalculable eons to acheive, and an additional one incalculable one to move through the rest of the bhumis while the last trace of the jñeya-avarana is removed. The kleśa-avarana is removed at the end of the seventh bhumi.

In other words, there is no rapid method in common Mahāyāna which ensures liberation within one to sixteen lifetimes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 12:59 PM

Title: Re: Mahāmudrā & Dzogchen

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

It's said that Gampopa most likely received semde teachings from Milarepa and put his

own spin on them, though I'm sure that is open to debate...

Malcolm wrote:

No, Gampopa started out as a Nyingmapa, then became a Kadampa monk, then met Milarepa towards the end of the latter's life.

asunthatneversets said:

The four naljors are:

- (i) shi-nè (zhi gNas)
- (ii) lhatong (lhag mThong)
- (iii) nyi-mèd (nyis med)
- (iv) lhundrüp (lhun grub)

Malcolm wrote:

It is the the four ting 'dzins (samadhis) and the first two are actually gnas pa (calm state) and mi gyo ba (non-movement); the others are fine. This is the system of Khams lugs sems sde.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 12:47 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

jeeprs said:

But I think it is only possible to use such things when one is not bound by them

Malcolm wrote:

If this were so there would be no point to Vajrayāna at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 12:45 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

this the explanation for someone who has realized the first bhumi in Mahāyāna.

The only vision that is non-karmic is buddhahood.

5heaps said:

your position doesn't seem to follow then. since the particular transformations into purity

Malcolm wrote:

There is no transformation into purity in sūtra, none at all. Just because a sūtrayāna practitioner realizes emptiness it does not mean that they have pure vision. That only happens when one becomes a Buddha.

Vajrayāna is the method of taking the path as the result, therefore, we train in pure vision of ourselves as deity mandalas right from the start of creation stage. There is no such training for anyone, including tenth stage bodhisattvas which is taught in sūtra. You cannot find one sūtra passage that even suggests this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 10th, 2013 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

5heaps said:

what about this argument:

when you realize subtle selflessness (the lack of a substantial self-sufficient self to persons), you subsequently cognize the arya truths and your ordinary self-identity dissolves, at which time, there is an appearance of a divine self-identity. divine meaning free from suffering, since you are briefly free from assenting to a substantial self.

Malcolm wrote:

No self identity at all arises at that time, divine or otherwise, but in the post-equipoise state, it is very clearly explained that one's vision is karmic, albeit, unreal. Therefore, as stated there is no method in common Mahāyāna similar to the path of transformation described in Vajrayāna.

5heaps said:

is the explanation the same for someone who realizes emptiness? namely, that the vision linked with cessation but still considered karmic. if so, what then is the unique feature of tantra that enables it to be non-karmic?

Malcolm wrote:

this the explanation for someone who has realized the first bhumi in Mahāyāna.

The only vision that is non-karmic is buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 9th, 2013 at 1:15 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

jeeprs said:

I am confused by that. What constitutes 'sexual misconduct'? How is one to interpret such traditional sources as the Surangama Sutra?

...

There are many comparable passages in Mahayana sutras, admonishing lust and sensual desire.

Malcolm wrote:

I am surprised you are asking this question. Sexual misconduct is defined by time, place, person and orifice. In terms of persons, it only defines married persons or persons spoken for (i.e. betrothed persons) as well as minors as well as person with whom engaging in sexual activity is inappropriate, such as non-consenting adults, in the case of rape of an adult (given that all sexual contact with minors is considered misconduct).

Secondly, there are many passages in the tantras which claim that passion can only be removed with passion, just as fire is removed with fire and water is removed with water, for example, in the Hevajra tantra, etc. Many such passages exist. The criteria for differentiating common vs. uncommon Mahayāna, i.e., Secret Mantra, is whether one is in the possession of the proper method or not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 9th, 2013 at 12:05 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Benten said:

The problem with tantra seems to be its all coded and as soon as you take it literal and break away from the ten virtues you are nothing less than a hot mess.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no prohibition against having sexual partners outside of marriage even in sūtra if one is also not married nor an exhortation to be married, even in sūtra, much less Vajrayāna.

The non-virtue of sexual misconduct does not mention anything about freely consenting free adults having relations with other freely consenting free adults. Further, alcohol is not mentioned amongst the ten non-virtues at all.

And, if you have a proper method, wine and sexual partners are not a problem (nowhere

did I imply multiple sexual partners -- but even that is fine providing the criteria mentioned above is met).

Finally, Padmasambhava's advice that one's conduct be fine as a grain of sand does not mean following rules; rather, it means being aware of circumstances and acting appropriately at all times.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 9th, 2013 at 11:58 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

5heaps said:

what about this argument:

when you realize subtle selflessness (the lack of a substantial self-sufficient self to persons), you subsequently cognize the arya truths and your ordinary self-identity dissolves, at which time, there is an appearance of a divine self-identity. divine meaning free from suffering, since you are briefly free from assenting to a substantial self.

Malcolm wrote:

No self identity at all arises at that time, divine or otherwise, but in the post-equipoise state, it is very clearly explained that one's vision is karmic, albeit, unreal. Therefore, as stated there is no method in common Mahāyāna similar to the path of transformation described in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 8th, 2013 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Vajrajapa / Guhysamaja Question

Content:

Vajrabhijna said:

As it stands, I have a very casual transmission from a kagyu lama, who asked me to study English sources I could find. Those that I have found, I believe draw from Gelug sources. This is the root of my concern.

I am not trying to mix anything, my question is geared rather at unmixing anything. So we can conclude that there is no difference in the Gelug texts, or Tsonkhapa's exposition of

the guhyasamaja, as from the Kagyu?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, for the most part the Gelug presentations of Guhyasamaja follow the commentarial tradition introduced by translator Go Lotsawa, who is considered part of the Sakya tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 7th, 2013 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Terrorist Bombing at Mahabodhi, Bodhgaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It should not go unnoticed that this attack was timed to coincide with HH Dalai Lama's birthday.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 7th, 2013 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Negative Consequence of Playing Cards

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am not so sure. Look at what it really requires to have a complete and pure refuge, it is not such an easy thing.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a very easy thing, as the Uttaratantra states:

Ultimate refuge

is only the buddha,

because the Muni is endowed with the dharma body.

If one understands that definition of refuge, the others become secondary and not so important at all since the dharmakāya is the source of all other refuges, and exists as an innate attribute in all sentient beings. Therefore, the highest, most perfect refuge is one's own primal nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 6th, 2013 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: people's reactions

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'm curious to hear stories (positive and negative) about how people in your life reacted whenever you consider yourself to have visibly "gotten serious" about Dharma practice.

Malcolm wrote:

MY family, atheists, never showed interest in Dharma, but were always supportive of my choice to be involved in Dharma, even when I thought I was a Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 5th, 2013 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

cdpatton said:

It was the failure of the government to maintain itself in the face of Hitler's illegalities that led to totalitarianism.

Malcolm wrote:

And those illegalities were largely permitted in an atmosphere of political disengagement and apathy.

Conditions are presently ripening in the United States for fascism to happen here. We are not there yet. But we are heading in that direction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 5th, 2013 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[

Actually, Facism in Italy, Germany and Spain came about because of lack of participation. For example, in 1933 in Germany, the Nazis only won because electiral turnout was abysmal.

kirtu said:

In the case of Germany that is untrue.

Malcolm wrote:

It is true:

"The resources of big business and the state were thrown behind the Nazis' campaign to achieve saturation coverage all over Germany. Brownshirts and SS patrolled and marched menacingly through the streets of cities and towns. A "combination of terror, repression and propaganda was mobilized in every... community, large and small, across the land." [6] To further ensure the outcome of the vote would be a Nazi majority, Nazi organizations "monitored" the vote process. In Prussia 50,000 members of the SS, SA and Stahlhelm were ordered to monitor the votes as deputy sheriffs by acting Interior Minister Hermann Göring."

The 1933 elections was one of the greatest vote suppression campaigns in modern electoral history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Simon E. said:

As a sidebar I find myself wondering , and not for the first time , if some citizens of the USA realise how this kind of hysterical over -reaction makes them appear in the eyes of the rest of the world.

Sönarn said:

Long time the rest of the world has no illusion about ... to pretend today that USA is the biggest democracy is a (very bad) joke. Everybody knows that ... except maybe US citizen?

Simon E. said:

I am sure that many Americans would find the reaction of its government just as puzzling as we Europeans do.

Malcolm wrote:

We do. I saw a billboard the other day that quipped " who said government doesn't listen?"

Everyone knows that the NSA has been recording all internet traffic and phone calls for at least decade. Snowden merely produced documentary evidence that is irrefutable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Konchog1 said:

History disagrees. From Caesar to Mao, dictators (which is what I assume you are referring to) have usually come into power through the passion of the people.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends very much on whose history one reads.

Actually, Facism in Italy, Germany and Spain came about because of lack of participation. For example, in 1933 in Germany, the Nazis only won because electoral turnout was abysmal.

Further, Mao and Ceasar did not come into power because of a popular mandate. They came into power through manipulation. In Ceasar's case, it was with the backing of his

army.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 1:42 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sentiments such as these are precursors to Fascism. Similarly, Obama's suggestion that we must weigh security against privacy, etc., are also such precursors.

M

Indrajala said:

Fascism is a natural response to failed alternatives. It can only come to exist through enough people supporting it, i.e., the mandate of the people.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Fascism never comes about because of a popular mandate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 12:43 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Konchog1 said:

If that is freedom, I'd rather be a slave.

Malcolm wrote:

People often prefer their own slavery if it comes at the expense of the liberty of others of whom they disapprove.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 4th, 2013 at 12:37 PM

Title: Re: The Hunting of Ed Snowden - the evolving power-play

Content:

Indrajala said:

Freedom is overrated.

Malcolm wrote:

Sentiments such as these are precursors to Fascism. Similarly, Obama's suggestion that we must weigh security against privacy, etc., are also such precursors.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 3rd, 2013 at 11:49 AM

Title: Re: Madhyamakaratnapradipa reference from the Derge Tengyur

Content:

Greg said:

In the Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism (Red Book), pg 169:

. . . it is stated in the Jewel Lamp of the Madhyamaka by the master Bhavya (skal-Idan): "The Madhyamaka of the Prasangika and the Svatantrika is the coarse, Outer Madhyamaka. It should indeed be expressed by those who profess well-informed intelligence during debates with [extremist] Outsiders, during the composition of great treatises, and while establishing texts which concern supreme reasoning. However, when the subtle, inner Madhyamaka is experientially cultivated, one should meditate on the nature of Yogacara-Madhyamaka."

The note associated with the quote indicates "The quotation given here does not occur in the extant Tibetan text of Bhavya's Madhyamakaratnapradipa, rather it paraphrases passages found on fols. 280-1 of the Derge canonical edn. of the text: dbu-m a, Vol. Tsha."

As far as I know the terms "Prasangika" and "Svatantrika" are Tibetan innovation when used to describe discrete approaches to Madhyamaka. So I'm guessing this "quote" is a rather loose "paraphrase" indeed. Can anyone shed some light on what it actually says in fols. 280-1 of the Derge canonical edn. of the Madhyamakaratnapradipa: dbu-ma, Vol. Tsha?

Malcolm wrote:

It is basically an explanation of madhyamaka view from a Shantarakshita style perspective.

There is no mention of either prasanga or svatantra in the entire text. It is not a text by Bhavaviveka. Bhavya is a much later master, post Shantarakshita.

This passage basically states that Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva and Candrakīrti present a so-called "coarse outer Madhyamakas" when they speak from the relative truth point of view of śrāvakas; but then Bhavya also presents a couple of citations by Āryadeva and Candrakīrti which shows that in terms of the relative truth these three masters support the concept of mind-only in relative truth, and that this is the inner subtle madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 3rd, 2013 at 9:45 AM

Title: Re: Which Skandha is Tathagatagarbha?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is sugatagarbha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 2nd, 2013 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Most recent terma?

Content:

mutsuk said:

Even before Sechen, he had drang-srong (bonpo) vows which he did not want to give back when he had to convert to the buddhist vinaya. He was forced to anyway... In any case, his appreciation of gter-ma was pristine from the start, mostly because nearly 99 per cent of the Bon literature (in which he was such an expert) is gter-ma.

Malcolm wrote:

If you read his bio, there he recounts that because he developed doubts about terma while at palpung he developed some obstacles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 30th, 2013 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

Ohhh, ok. I'm assuming this isn't invoking the dharmapala, right? Something that's "unique" to zhitro?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a Muni for each of the six realms.

Lotus_Bitch said:

In the mandala of xitro, does Yamaraja have the same appearance as the dharmapala of the same name?

All I need is a yes or no answer...I must know!!!

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

smcj said:

In all the various wonderful descriptions of Amitabja's Pure Land, has anyone heard their political system described?

tobes said:

Vow number 10 of Dharmakara in the longer sutra sounds a lot like Lennon's political utopia;

"Blessed one, may I not awaken to unsurpassable, perfect, full awakening if the living beings who are born in this buddha-field should conceive of any idea of property, even if it is only with regard to their own body."

"Imagine no possessions
I wonder if you can
No need for greed or hunger
A brotherhood of man
Imagine all the people sharing all the world"

Who was arguing for natural property rights again?? Not in the pure lands!

Malcolm wrote:
Correction, not in Amitabha's pureland, populated only by males.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 10:12 PM
Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism
Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:
Ohhh, ok. I'm assuming this isn't invoking the dharmapala, right? Something that's "unique" to zhitro?

Malcolm wrote:
There is a Muni for each of the six realms.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 11:52 AM
Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Dharma never promises another better life. In fact it assures us that if we are passive and refuse to put the teachings into practice we will certainly not experience a better life in the hereafter.

The Buddha of the hell realms is Yamaraja.

M

Lotus_Bitch said:

That's the first time I've heard of Yama being referred to as a buddha.
Yamaraja=Dharmaraja right?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a Xitro thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Religions, nearly universally promising another, better life after this one, have always been manipulated to justify the abuses of the power structure. Even if we do believe in rebirth, it shouldn't justify our complacency toward present injustice.

Also, I don't think both views are necessarily at odds. Bodhisattvas don't just descend into the hell realms with the intent of planting the seeds of dharma in future lives, right? They also try to assuage the suffering of the present.

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma never promises another better life. In fact it assures us that if we are passive and refuse to put the teachings into practice we will certainly not experience a better life in the hereafter.

The Buddha of the hell realms is Yamaraja.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Will said:

Good grief, what are bodhisattvas up to anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

Benefitting others, but I don't think they were putting up Dharma event posters.

Will said:

True - more likely pillars of Dharma wisdom - like Ashoka did.

Malcolm wrote:

Sad thing is no one could read them after a couple hundred years, and worse no one in india knew who ashoka was until his memory was revived by the brits in the 19th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Will said:

Good grief, what are bodhisattvas up to anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

Benefitting others, but I don't think they were putting up Dharma event posters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

It seems like you're saying that working for a political situation that brings people the relative liberties to practice cannot be the ripening of karma...

Malcolm:

There is nothing wrong with working for a political situation that brings people more samсарic liberty in general. Imagining that one is doing so to enable people to practice Dharma is a delusion — also nothing wrong with that either, apart from that fact that it is a useless occupation.

We contemplate the eight freedoms and ten endowments of a precious human birth in order to appreciate how truly rare is the opportunity to meet the Dharma and how truly difficult it is to put it into practice.

And,

when we figure out which of those freedoms and advantages that are missing, we are told to do anything in our power to gain them. Even samсарic activities, right?

Malcolm wrote:

For example, if someone is born in a country where even the name Dharma does not exist, what is there to do? If a sentient being is not born a human being, what is there to do? If one is born without sense organs, etc., what is there to do? There is no exhortation to supply conditions lacking in a human birth to make it "precious". You either have them or you don't. All of them are a result of karma, not one of them is a result of any kind of social activism. If you find you have the eighteen qualifications, then you should practice the Dharma. One either has these eighteen factors or one doesn't. If one has them, don't waste time on non-Dharmic activities.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 29th, 2013 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

It seems like you're saying that working for a political situation that brings people the relative liberties to practice cannot be the ripening of karma...

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with working for a political situation that brings people more samsaric liberty in general. Imagining that one is doing so to enable people to practice Dharma is a delusion — also nothing wrong with that either, apart from that fact that it is a useless occupation.

We contemplate the eight freedoms and ten endowments of a precious human birth in order to appreciate how truly rare is the opportunity to meet the Dharma and how truly difficult it is to put it into practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 28th, 2013 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is simple: if you met with the Dharma in this life, you met with it in a past one. If one does not have that dependent origination, one will never meet the Dharma in this life.

anjali said:

People have to encounter the Dharma for the first time in some lifetime. Why can that not happen for some in this lifetime?

Malcolm wrote:

It is as statistically improbable as it is statistically possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 28th, 2013 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

These "liberties" are a result of our karma based on our own actions in past lives. There is nothing political about them.

Nilasarasvati said:

Kind of circular isn't it?

If you don't have the Karma to practice the Dharma, too bad! Work hard and make aspirations to be reborn wealthier so that you can!

If you have the karma to practise the Dharma, great! No need to help others less privileged do the same because it's just their karma.

Or, to be more than a little irreverent:

Shantarakshita: Please come to Tibet and help King Trisong Deutsen subdue the untameable beings, deities, and black magicians of this barbarous land!

Padmasambhava: I don't get involved in politics. If the Tibetans had the good merit to practice the Dharma, they'd have been born in a central land in the first place.

Malcolm wrote:

It is sad that people who are ostensibly Dharma practitioners seem not to understand the infallibility of karma. Nevertheless. It is simple: if you met with the Dharma in this life, you met with it in a past one. If one does not have that dependent origination, one will never meet the Dharma in this life. This why evangelism is useless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 28th, 2013 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All politics is reducible to parties with different sorts of self-oriented goals, including the politics of deep ecology (which has a self-oriented goal i.e. the preservation of the earth's ecosphere for all beings). But even saving the planet is not a Dharma goal. The goal of Dharma is concerned solely with the liberation of persons from samsara. If we extend this to Mahāyāna, still, all Mahāyāna schools are concerned with the liberation of persons from samsara.

The political process at all levels may be used to beautify samsara or control samsara, but politics is ultimately samsaric, that is the point of differentiating Dharma and politics.

tobes said:

Again, you just introduce a sweeping, immutable definition of politics - without reasons or evidence.

I do not think politics is reducible to this.

Two reasons why the goal of all Mahayana schools is itself - innately - political:

1. Practicing the Dharma requires negative liberty (freedom from coercion, either physical or epistemic).
2. Practicing the Dharma requires positive liberty (freedom to make use of ones potentiality).

This denies your basic claim that politics is necessarily ultimately samsaric: the goal of politics might be to liberate persons from samsara. Nagarjuna certainly thought that was plausible.

Malcolm wrote:

These "liberties" are a result of our karma based on our own actions in past lives. There is nothing political about them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 27th, 2013 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The function of the Dharma is to end samsaric dependent origination i.e. --> affliction --> action --> suffering, etc. This in turn is based upon afflictive obscurations. Afflictive obscurations in turn are based on knowledge obscurations, and the root of those is the habit of "I am".

This habit of "I am" (unreal as its supposed basis of designation may be) is sufficient for considering ordinary persons autonomous, since it is this very habit that gives them the capacity to act as autonomous agents i.e. acting solely with reference to their own interests.

The process of politics is entirely afflictive and afflicted, as far as I can tell, based on various false senses of identity, "I am", "We are", etc.

tobes said:

The process of a particular kind of politics might be predicated on various false senses of identity. But you have not established that politics per se necessarily expresses or manifests as those afflicted processes.

You just assert this as an immutable definition.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I assert this as a practical definition, since there are no other kinds of politics or political processes apart from those which I define above, AFAIK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 26th, 2013 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Just one issue, for me: seperating Dharma from politics seems to be like trying to seperate samsara from Nirvana, the relative from the absolute, etc... ie, as things stand right now, it just ain't happening!

Malcolm wrote:

Both samsara and nirvana are conventional states, as are the notions relative and absolute, etc. But unlike dharmin and dharmatā of water, for example; we can't really say that the intrinsic nature of politics [dharmin] is Dharma [dharmatā].

gregkavarnos said:

So you are saying there is something (a dharma) which is not (included in the) Dharmakaya? Actually maybe Dharmadhatu would probably be the more correct term.

Malcolm wrote:

Am I saying politics is not empty? Of course politics is empty, so is Dharma. Everything is included in the state of dharmakāya. But that has nothing to with the present discussion. At least, not as far as I can observe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 26th, 2013 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Just one issue, for me: seperating Dharma from politics seems to be like trying to seperate samsara from Nirvana, the relative from the absolute, etc... ie, as things stand right now, it just ain't happening!

Malcolm wrote:

Both samsara and nirvana are conventional states, as are the notions relative and absolute, etc. But unlike dharmin and dharmatā of water, for example; we can't really say that the intrinsic nature of politics [dharmin] is Dharma [dharmatā].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 25th, 2013 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: On Dealing with Destructive Emotions

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Does any of this stuff sound familiar?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, fruit of the paths of Mahāmudra and Dzogchen are the same.

The differences lie in how one is introduced to one's primordial state and the method used for discovering and maintaining that state.

Mahāmudra has very few methods: either the two stages, practicing the four yogas or suddenly awakening, like Saraha.

Dzogchen, by contrast, has a plethora which are adapted to every conceivable capacity of interested persons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 25th, 2013 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

The Buddha does reject the autonomous person conventionally. It is not a question of finding a place where he does so explicitly, as it is about realising the disjuncture between the kind of conventional person posited by the Buddha, and the kinds of autonomy westerners tend to mean when they say autonomy. Sure there is still a conventional person of some kind, but the kind of conventional person given (by the Buddha) is - necessarily - a process and relational conventional person. i.e. there is no moral autonomy of the kind favoured by western theologians or philosophers, grounded in a concept of soul or rationality or will or transcendental ego. There is perhaps something akin to what is favoured by the British empiricists - a dispositional theory of agency where there is some kind of autonomy found in choice making....but this is still a very social conception of agency.

Malcolm wrote:

First, when I say autonomous person, I am referring to a person, the most irreducible nominal basis of which is a unique and independent mind stream, with a unique and specific karma, as well as unique and specific causes and conditions. Invoking *karana hetu* [each and everything is a cause for all other things apart from itself] etc. is too broad and is an overapplication of the principle.

Autonomy is essential to the definition of "person" [pudgala]. A convention is understood on the basis its definition. Buddha deconstructed persons via the devices

of skandhas, āyatanas and dhātus, etc. Nevertheless, karma ripens only on an autonomous person. So it is difficult to argue that Buddha denied autonomous persons conventionally.

tobes said:

The question of dependent origination probably lies at the heart of this conversation; this is where the two truths become important. I think that the Dharma leads us into an apprehension of the dependently originated nature of things, not away from dependent origination per se. But I'm fairly sure you think otherwise - and this is probably the reason for our disagreement.

Malcolm wrote:

The function of the Dharma is to end samsaric dependent origination i.e. --> affliction --> action --> suffering, etc. This in turn is based upon afflictive obscurations. Afflictive obscurations in turn are based on knowledge obscurations, and the root of those is the habit of "I am".

This habit of "I am" (unreal as its supposed basis of designation may be) is sufficient for considering ordinary persons autonomous, since it is this very habit that gives them the capacity to act as autonomous agents i.e. acting solely with reference to their own interests.

The process of politics is entirely afflictive and afflicted, as far as I can tell, based on various false senses of identity, "I am", "We are", etc.

tobes said:

Obviously the Buddha does not instruct us to join a political party - but it does not follow from that that the Dharma is distinct from politics. For many reasons - namely that politics is not reducible to party politics and that a contemporary Buddhist cannot read the Buddha's advice in the Nikaya's and apply it as if we are still in ancient India (i.e. obviously there was not party politics taking place there).

Malcolm wrote:

All politics is reducible to parties with different sorts of self-oriented goals, including the politics of deep ecology (which has a self-oriented goal i.e. the preservation of the earth's ecosphere for all beings). But even saving the planet is not a Dharma goal. The goal of Dharma is concerned solely with the liberation of persons from samsara. If we extend this to Mahāyāna, still, all Mahāyāna schools are concerned with the liberation of persons from samsara.

The political process at all levels may be used to beautify samsara or control samsara, but politics is ultimately samsaric, that is the point of differentiating Dharma and politics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 25th, 2013 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

And the biological sciences have debunked the need for "animal protein" with valid scientific method.

dzogchungpa said:

This is interesting to me. Can you provide a reference?

Also, I would point out that proteins are not the only macronutrients.

seeker242 said:

The most recent reference that I know of comes from the "American Dietetic Association", now known as "The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics" and is the world's largest organization of food and nutrition professionals. They published a well referenced position paper on it. It can be found here. The abstract is pretty self explanatory. <http://www.eatright.org/About/Content.aspx?id=8357>

Malcolm wrote:

Bunch of quacks.

A 1995 report noted the AND received funding from companies like McDonald's, PepsiCo, The Coca Cola Company, Sara Lee, Abbott Nutrition, General Mills, Kellogg's, Mars, McNeil Nutritionals, SOYJOY, Truvia, Unilever, and The Sugar Association as corporate sponsorship.[16] The AND also partners with ConAgra Foods, which produces Orville Redenbacher, Slim Jims, Hunt's Ketchup, SnackPacks, and Hebrew National hot dogs, to maintain the American Dietetic Association/ConAgra Foods Home Food Safety...It's in Your Hands program.[48] Additionally, the AND earns revenue from corporations by selling space at its booth during conventions, doing this for soft drinks and candy makers.[16][49]

In April 2013, a dietitian working on a panel charged with setting policy on genetically modified foods for the academy contended she was removed for pointing out that two of its members had ties to Monsanto, one of the biggest makers of genetically modified seeds.[50] The resulting controversy highlighted the fact that Ms. Smith Edge, chairwoman of the committee charged with developing the GMO policy, is a senior vice president at the International Food Information Council, which is largely financed by food, beverage and agriculture businesses, including companies like DuPont, Bayer CropScience and Cargill, companies that were among the biggest financial opponents of a State of California GMO labeling initiative.[51]

The AND maintains that being at the "same table" with food companies is important in order to exert a positive influence over their products and message, although critics describe this as an "unhealthy alliance" between the AND and junk food companies.[49][52] The accusation is that despite what good may come of such programs, it ultimately whitewashes (similar to the greenwashing efforts of

environmentally irresponsible companies) the brand's role in the country's food ecosystem. Watchdogs note that the AND rarely criticizes food companies, believing it to be out of fear of "biting the hand that feeds them." [53][54][55] Nutrition expert Marion Nestle opined that she believed that as long as the AND partners with the makers of food and beverage products, "its opinions about diet and health will never be believed [to be] independent." [49] A 2011 survey found that 80% of Academy members are critical of the Academy's position. They believe that the Academy is endorsing corporate sponsors and their products when it allows their sponsorship. [56]
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Academy_of_Nutrition_and_Dietetics

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I cannot see how one can practice Dharma in this world system without impacting on a social/political level. Seems impossible to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I ever say that Dharma practitioners were incapable of impacting society or politics? No, I never suggested such a thing. In fact I acknowledged several times that Dharma practitioners could have such impacts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The very fact that a Bodhisattva requires an other to act on, undeniably immediately places them in a social and political context.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not bear the consequence that Dharma and politics are mutually inclusive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

He did not say that about growing vegetables!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in fact for monks, cultivating vegetables is wrong livelihood because digging in the ground etc., causes harm to sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The social character of Dharma is also clearly evident in the "other-oriented" attitude of the Bodhisattvas.

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhisattvas are "other-oriented" because they see how sentient beings are suffering. They engage in deeds to benefit others.

But whether those deeds are transformative or are worldly does not depend on the social relationships in which those deeds take place.

Their function as deeds depends on the depth of realization of the person, and not the social context of the deeds themselves.

For example, the acts of giving away bread to the hungry performed by an ordinary person, a bodhisattva and a buddha do not have the same value. The deed is evaluated on the realization of the agent, not on the plight of the recipient, since all recipients are assumed to be suffering equally by virtue of their all being trapped in the three realms of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

It clearly cannot be contained to the sphere of the personal.

The Dharma opens us up to an ontology of interdependence, which radically undermines the distinctions between the personal and the social.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't attain liberation through Dharma practice in groups.

tobes said:

That in itself is highly political, because it denies the kinds of politics predicated on atomistic, autonomous individuals.

I'm really not sure how this could be denied.....

Malcolm wrote:

Can you point to some teaching by the Buddha where he rejected autonomous persons conventionally? The same arguments that negate the identity of the person can be used to negate the identity of the polis. Certainly the Buddha's intent was not to replace a sense individual personhood with a sense of collective or dependent personhood. His intent was to expose absence of identity, the lack of recognition of which is the primary cause of suffering.

Your "ontology of interdependence" is something that has been abstracted out of Dharma teachings by intellectuals; but it is not point of Dharma itself. The point of Dharma teachings is to overcome that fact of interdependence. The point of Dharma is the personal reversal of samsaric dependent origination.

Where does the Buddha instruct us to use our Dharma conscience to join the political party of our choice, for example the Green Party, The Tea Party, etc.?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Because it seems like Chatral Sangye Dorje does.

Malcolm wrote:

He is entitled to his opinion. I don't follow people because they have famous reputations or are the disciples of famous people. I honestly could care less what Chatral Rinpoche thinks. I know what I think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Do you really think though that there is no difference between eating a bowl of cheerios and eating a big bowl of hamburger helper?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Whereas if I eat a bowl of cheerios, I'm only dealing with the harm that came from raising the grain.

Malcolm wrote:

For example us say you are eating organic cheerios. Organic oats are generally fertilized with bone meal, all from slaughtered animals.

You cannot abstract your Cheerios out of the loop. It just wont work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

smcj said:

From "Writings of Kalu Rinpoche" tr. McLeod:

NON-MERITORIOUS KARMA

The non-virtuous acts emerge from emotional dispositions, and are explained as follows:

Physical Acts

The first is the taking of life. Taking life because of desire means killing for the sake of meat, skin, bones, musk, or other parts of an animal, for money, or to protect yourself or your friends. Taking life out of anger means killing because of enmity or dispute. Taking life for the sake of offerings or gifts, thinking that it is virtuous, is killing because of stupidity.

Greg & I are both Kagyus. Maybe it's a Kagyu thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand the formal definitions of how the three mental non-virtues work and their consequence on the actions of killing and so on. This is all very carefully explained in Abhidharmakosha [chapter four], which I have studied in close detail for many years.

But you cannot kill without aversion for the thing you are killing, even if you are killing it out of greed [brnab sems] or wrong view [log lta] -- underneath that greed or wrong view will still be a deeper affliction of hatred.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

To slay a sentient being requires the desire that they no longer exist [dvesha]. All such slaying then comes from a sense of enmity.

gregkavarnos said:

When I used to hunt rabbits I did it coz they tasted really good as a pot roast with red wine, bay leaves, baby onions and garlic, not coz I hated them. On the contrary, they were cute, furry, fluffy and hippity-hoppity, but they tasted damn fine!

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry Greg, but in order to slay, you have to desire the non-existence of another sentient being. It is impossible that state of mind exists without being tinged with aversion, no matter how slight.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

I still think your conception of "individual only" dharma is slanted by Western romanticism, individualism, the enlightenment or something---I mean, I agree with all the consequences you probably have in mind (when Dharma and Politics go wrong--our current situation in Myanmar for example) but I'm afraid you have your head in the ether cloud of ideal shoulds and shouldn'ts rather than talking about people's ordinary lived realities.

Malcolm wrote:

My opinion is a product of my direct observation of people in action with each other "in the name of the Dharma" over the past 25 years; and having studied the socio-political history of Buddhism as it has existed for the past 2500 years in this epoch.

Just as there is no group karma, there is also no group Dharma. Dharma is solely about personal evolution and transformation. If enough people evolve and transform, well then, what a nice place to live that would be.

In fact, it is the observation of people's ordinary lived realities that has lead me to my present conclusion. It is one of the reasons I made a radical distinction between Dharma and Buddhism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, not taking life is about eliminating enmity in your own mind, first, and secondarily about protecting others.

gregkavarnos said:

If it was about eliminating enmity then it would be proscription against enmity and not specifically against taking life. Anyway, people do not take life based strictly on enmity, they may do so based on greed, on pride, etc... A butcher does not hate the livestock he slaughters.

Malcolm wrote:

To slay a sentient being requires the desire that they no longer exist [dvesha]. All such slaying then comes from a sense of enmity.

gregkavarnos said:

This is not a quality of politics per se but a quality of samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Politics is just a samsara of hope and fear. In politics there are always winners and always losers. In Dharma there are only winners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

With the main issue being that some types of food are more harmful and other types are less harmful!

Malcolm wrote:

This is false. All food production is equally harmful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The sphere of the Dharma is not the polis, it is the person.

Then Dharma is not about creating a better society, or a more equitable society -- it never has been. The sphere of the Dharma is personal, it is about personal evolution.

gregkavarnos said:

And the teachings of the Noble Eightfold Path? The proscription on not taking life is about not taking another's life. That makes it social. No taking what is not given (stealing)? Social. etc...

Malcolm wrote:

No, not taking life is about eliminating enmity in your own mind, first, and secondarily about protecting others.

Ahimsa, on the other hand, is a mental factor which functions in concert with the other positive mental factors, also it is not social necessarily. For example, we extend the principle of ahimsa even to so called "non-sentient" life like trees and so on.

But you know, this is just my opinion. I think that Dharma and politics are separate, not that they have to be kept secret. We can clearly see the results of the two things are very different. One results inevitably in peace and contentment; the other, constant struggle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 24th, 2013 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The sphere of the Dharma is not the polis, it is the person.

Nilasarasvati said:

How does this distinction of yours function when it runs into the concept of Sangha?

Malcolm wrote:

Good question. Is the Sangha a polis? No, I don't think so. It is merely a name for a group of people on the path or who have realized the result of that path who may or may not live or associate in a community. For example, pratyakabuddhas are also Sangha, etc.

To the extent that such like-minded people assemble [sangha] and work to achieve a common spiritual goal, it is constant struggle for them to keep their relationships pure and focused on the Dharma. Too often, such community efforts wind up spoiled by politics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 23rd, 2013 at 6:41 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

For mine, I do not see how 'The Dharma' - in any form - is distinct from action, interrelation, causes, conditions and effects. So long as it is related to these things, then it may shape, constitute or inform them. And these are partly political phenomena, unless one chooses to define 'the political' in a very specific and particular way, such as a liberal-democratic sphere of law making and popular representation.

I have yet to see a convincing argument against that.

Malcolm wrote:

The sphere of the Dharma is not the polis, it is the person.

Then Dharma is not about creating a better society, or a more equitable society -- it never has been. The sphere of the Dharma is personal, it is about personal evolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 23rd, 2013 at 6:36 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

So in short: one of the most contradictory elements in this thread is the deeply political claim that the Dharma ought to be separate from politics.

It is contradictory because that position itself situates the Dharma in a very particular, highly political way.

i.e. it frames the Dharma through and in relation to a liberal-secularist ideology.

Malcolm wrote:

If you prefer to see it that way, you will.

I don't see it that way.

- 1) the claim that Dharma and politics belong to separate spheres is not a political claim
- 2) that claim itself does not politicize Dharma

3) that claim has a long tradition stemming back to a pre-liberal secularist era.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 23rd, 2013 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Malcolm, I've always heard "Nirvana is beyond extremes" which seems much more helpful in establishing the view---is it really just Nirvana is peace (ksanti?).

smcj said:

I'm not a translator, but i prefer something that suggests the end of the road, like 'finality' or 'fulfillment' rather than 'peaceful' or 'peace'.

Malcolm wrote:

༥ འདུ་བྱེད་ཐམས་ཅད་མི་རྟག་ཅིང་།
ཟག་བཅས་ཐམས་ཅད་སྦྱག་བསྐྱལ་བ།
ཆོས་རྒྱམས་སྣོང་ཞིང་བདག་མེད་པ།
ཟུང་ངན་འདས་པ་ཞི་བའོ།

Literally:

All conditioned [phenomena] are impermanent.

All contaminated [phenomena] are suffering.

All phenomena are empty and lack self.

Nirvana is peace [ཞི་བའོ].

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 22nd, 2013 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Well Politics isn't a substitute or equivalent to Dharma...that's silly.

As for your translation of the 4 Seals...hmmm...I think it leaves much of the nuance out.

Malcolm wrote:

They is generally given as:

All conditioned phenomena are impermanent.

All afflicted phenomena are suffering.

All phenomena lack self.

Nirvana is peaceful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I cannot see how you can describe it so unidirectionally.

Malcolm wrote:

What can I say? When Dharma and politics mix, politics is never enhanced, and Dharma loses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, of course Dharma practitioners can act politically, even have political biases and opinions, but they should never confuse their political beliefs and opinions with the Dharma they are attempting to put into practice.

gregkavarnos said:

So are you saying that Dharma cannot inform politics (political ideology, political action)?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you are a Dharma practitioner, everything you do should be informed by your observance of Dharma principles such as non-harming, and so on. But, should a Dharma practitioner seek to outlaw abortion through political action and claim it is an act of Dharma "politics"? No, I don't think so. Why? Because we should not try and legislate our conscience on others. That would be forcing other people to adopt our principles. This is antithetical to Dharma, in my opinion.

So while a Dharma person may make this or that political decision based on their conscience as a Dharma practitioner, they should not claim that their political choices are "Dharmic" as opposed to the political choices of a Christian, Moslem or a religious Jew.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: East Bay - White Tara and Vajrayogini with Jetsun Kushok

Content:

namoh said:

I'm curious, and perhaps Malcolm or Kirtu could shed some light on this, but is the

Uncommon White Tara given by Jetsun Kusho la the same as the White Tara initiation that HE Dagmo Kusho Sakya in Seattle gives from time to time?

Will

Malcolm wrote:
Probably.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

All Buddhist political elements that have been unable to defend themselves have gotten swallowed up except for Nepal.

That's supposed to read: except for Bhutan. I would just change it but it's been quoted in response already.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Bhutan is a very repressive kingdom. Hardly the ideal Dharma polity you imagine.

<https://www.greenleft.org.au/node/40554>

<http://www.expontomagazine.com/nl/opinie/244-bhutans-way-of-ethnic-cleansing>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhutanese_refugees

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 21st, 2013 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

People still have to make mundane decisions about grain storage, etc. Scarce resources still need to be allocated (the essence of economics) and people still need guidance in living in society (the essence of politics) if only to promote cooperation. Beyond one's door some degree of picking and choosing becomes necessary.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course -- the role of politics is just such practical considerations.

But when people start saying "My point of view about grain storage is justified in this or that sutra of the Buddha", than at that point one is, to quote a mind training slogan, "reducing a god into a demon".

The difference between politics and Dharma is the difference between glasses and a mirror: one uses the former to focus on things outside oneself; but a mirror is used to investigate oneself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Secondly, your scenario requires a monarchy.

Doesn't require a monarchy. That part of the myth is irrelevant.

Malcolm wrote:

Seems pretty key to me.

kirtu said:

Third, Shambhala was destroyed by other humans, so it didn't really work out so well for the Shambhalians,

All Buddhist political elements that have been unable to defend themselves have gotten swallowed up except for Nepal. This is a serious problem. But it probably just means that Shambhala-like communities need to be created in relatively stable environments.

Malcolm wrote:

Shambhala was a kingdom, a real historical place. It was destroyed by Muslims in the eighth century.

kirtu said:

Anyway Buddhist utopianism is as much a fantasy as any other kind of utopianism.

Really? Like Changchub Dorje's commune? It sounds like that worked out pretty well.

Malcolm wrote:

Chanchub Dorje's place was not a utopia. It was just a small place in Khams where there were a bunch of Dharma practitioners following a teacher. But there was certainly no political ideology governing the place, utopian or otherwise. If one is a perfect Dharma practitioner, what need for politics will one have?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

jeeprs said:

Politics is unavoidable on the level of conventional existence. It might have no ultimate significance but as long as people have to live in communities, follow laws, provide public services, and so on, then some kind of political engagement is unavoidable.

Even the Buddhist teaching itself is only an 'expedient means' to help beings realise the true nature. That is the meaning of the parable of the Raft, is it not?

It follows from that, I would think, that the kind of political system that Buddhism would encourage would be minimalist and self-limiting. Of course the obvious difficulty with that is that the ruthless will immediately see the opportunities for exploiting it. So in an 'ideal existence' there would be no need for politics, or even Buddhism, for that matter, but the world is never like that, it is an intermediate realm, within which politics plays a necessary part. I don't see how you can avoid that without basically ceding the field to self-interest.

Malcolm wrote:

Politics is all about self-interest. That is yet another reason that it is incompatible with Dharma. Politics is not based on wisdom. It is always based on conflicts.

Buddhisms of course are not Dharma, and can encourage all the politics they like -- this is why we can have Green Buddhism, Marxist Buddhism, Conservative Buddhism, etc. Buddhisms are just sects based on the limitations and biases of their followers.

As I said, of course Dharma practitioners can act politically, even have political biases and opinions, but they should never confuse their political beliefs and opinions with the Dharma they are attempting to put into practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: East Bay - White Tara and Vajrayogini with Jetsun Kushok

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Thanks. So, is this practice related to what DJKR will be giving this August:
<http://www.siddharthasintent.org/2013/01/abhisheka-and-teachings.html>,
which I am also planning to attend?

Malcolm wrote:

Different lineages: that relates to Vimalamitra, Padmasambhava and Shri Singha, if I recall correctly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 9:36 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

So individual ownership is natural, but particular individuals per se nor particular entities do not substantially exist.

Malcolm wrote:

So individual ownership is natural [conventionally, just as selves are], but particular individuals per se nor particular entities do not substantially exist [ultimately].

tobes said:

So who naturally owns what and how is that grounded?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventional persons own conventional things.

tobes said:

you need a theory of substance to ground a claim for natural rights.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not follow: you simply need conventional persons.

tobes said:

Most Buddhists profoundly reject such a theory, and it is clearly not found in the sutta addressed to Siggalakka

Malcolm wrote:

What is found in the Siggalaka sutta is the notion that lay people should employ others, save wealth, and so on -- all of which is predicated on the common sense notion that individuals own things.

tobes said:

You can however, get ground for positivist rights, when you acknowledge that concepts (and thus, rights) are nominal and conventional

Malcolm wrote:

Water is a convention, nevertheless, wetness is innate to water. Conventionality and innateness are not mutually exclusive, though some people who badly misunderstand things think so.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

Moreover, whilst I agree that the precept not to take property presupposes a theory of property rights, that theory cannot be a 'natural right to individual ownership' - the predications of such a theory are not at all commensurate with Buddhist metaphysics or ethics.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. Just read the Siggilaka sutta.

tobes said:

That only leaves the possibility of a positivist right

Malcolm wrote:

Stealing is a natural non-virtue, not a "positivist" non-virtue. Therefore, ownership is a natural right, not a positivist right.

In any case, you can have all the fine definitions and subtle nonsense you want. It is just intellectual self-stimulation. Dharma and politics are not compatible.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 20th, 2013 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: East Bay - White Tara and Vajrayogini with Jetsun Kushok

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I'm curious about this Uncommon White Tara Empowerment. She seems to give it quite often.

Does anyone here know anything about it?

kirtu said:

It's an Annutarayoga tantra White Tara that may come from Jamyang Khyentse Wango.

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=White_Tara_Wishfulfilling_Wheel is the RigaWiki entry. Generally Sakayapas don't talk about the details of higher practices and Khenpo Kalsang said next to nothing about it. So it's a kind of secret practice to some extent although HE Jetsun Kusho-la gives it often.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really that secret at all.

The origin of the practice is Bari Lotsawa, passed through the Kagyu lineage (Gampopa apparently extended his life with this practice) until it rejoined Sakya during the period of Tsarchen Losal Gyatso. It was one of Khyentse Wangpo's very important practices and he supposedly possessed a thangka of White Tara that could speak.

It is a very wonderful practice, but it is quite complicated in terms of the visualization. Khyentse Wangpo composed a teaching manual on it, that is spread out over one week or so.

The essential visualization of the protection cakra is combined into Dzogchen Community Tara practice. So receiving this initiation and practice is a good support for the DC practice.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcom said:

No. You do this as a practitioner on the path, not when you have realized mahāmudra. Anyway, you are missing the point -- which is: only in Vajrayāna (anuttarayoga tantra) does one make offerings to oneself as the deity from the beginning. These principles are so basic, I am surprised that practitioners who have been practicing for years do not understand this.

Ben Yuan said:

Thanks for clarifying.

I hope it did not come across as if I was trying to pass my suggestion as an official practice of a lineage, it is just something I made up myself. Apologies.

Malcolm wrote:

Ah, well — it is always best to base oneself on authority. In reality, the proper way to

have a conversation about the dharma is to make a statement, then present a sutra or a tantra which shows that one has not indulged in personal fabrications. Then the worst thing that can happen is that someone will show you why you have not understood the sense of the statement.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 7:16 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

greentara said:

Indeed no political position is in accordance with the dharma. Discord resides anywhere where people are urged to take sides in a way that urges them, as Iago does in Shakespeare's Othello, to "mock the meat" on which hate, jealousy and desire for power feeds.

gregkavarnos said:

Really? And what of King Menander and Ashoka then?

Malcolm wrote:

Ashoka's biased favoring of the Vaibhajyavadins was pure politics and not Dharma. Also, he was a war criminal (which everyone seems to blank out on), excused because he was forgotten in India until the Brits revived his memory from the pillars (which no one could read for two millennia.)

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 7:15 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

Example 1: if from the perspective of the Dharma, there can be no grasping to phenomenal entities, no sense of 'mine', no sense of possession....then it follows that there cannot be a grounding for individual ownership - in the form of natural, innate or even positivist rights.

Malcolm wrote:

False, if this were the case, there could be no precept against taking what is not given. Property is recognized as a natural right in Dharma. I.e. the precept against taking what is not given.

For example, in Dharma, it is illegal to destroy the homes of beings. For example, the bodhisattva vow maintains that it is violation of that vow to destroy cities, towns and so on. One could extend this to ant hills and so on.

tobes said:

Therefore, if a Buddhist practices a politics predicated on the preservation of those rights, they are out of accord with the Dharma.

However, if a Buddhist practices a politics which is explicitly the negation of those individual rights to ownership, than she is in accord with the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

False, as above.

tobes said:

It is not the case that both of those positions are equal with respect to the Dharma, and that therefore, there is no relationship between the political and the Dharma. One is in accord with it, one is not in accord with it.

Malcolm wrote:

Those positions are equal with respect to Dharma since neither position has to do with achieving liberation in Dharmic sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

If you have actualized your perception 100% as the deity.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No. You do this as a practitioner on the path, not when you have realized mahāmudra. Anyway, you are missing the point -- which is: only in Vajrayāna (anuttarayoga tantra) does one make offerings to oneself as the deity from the beginning. These principles are so basic, I am surprised that practitioners who have been practicing for years do not understand this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

Ben Yuan said:

If you sense a tasty piece of food, and then in your mind later you desire that tasty piece of food, thinking of all it's good and pleasurable and gratifying qualities, you can dedicate all the pleasure of that thought to the Buddhas. Similarly, when you sense the tasty piece of food, you can dedicate the pleasure to the Buddhas, and of course, when you are eating, you can visualise yourself as offering it to the Buddhas a food offering.

Malcolm wrote:

Which just generally reinforces the idea that common Mahāyāna is not about enjoying sense pleasures for oneself, unlike Vajrayāna.

Ben Yuan said:

Not if you are the Buddha who is eating the offering (which you are).

Malcolm wrote:

If you are practicing Vajrayāna there is no need to dedicate the enjoyment of the objects of the five senses to "the buddhas", you enjoy them since you are offering them to yourself. There is no method of doing this in common Mahāyāna. It simply does not exist there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

in so far as consciously trying to hide your views about politics could be a political choice.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't try to hide my political views, I merely understand that they are not Dharma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Politics is fundamentally about accepting and rejecting — the basis of the eight so called worldly dharmas i.e. praise/blame and so on.

...

This is why Dharma and politics are incompatible, and why, even though Dharma practitioners may act politically if they choose, they should understand that those

actions are based in human ethics rather than sublime Dharma.

kirtu said:

However we have the mythological example of Shambhala where enlightened Dharma rulers were able to act politically without their actions based on human ethics. We can begin over time to actualize this archetype.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

One word there, Kirt, and it is a big one: "mythological".

Secondly, your scenario requires a monarchy.

Third, Shambhala was destroyed by other humans, so it didn't really work out so well for the Shambhalians, kind of like Stalin's Socialism in One Country. That didn't work out either. Anyway Buddhist utopianism is as much a fantasy as any other kind of utopianism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 19th, 2013 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Also, the Thinley Norbu quote has a lot of really amazing implications that have gone undiscussed. I may have completely misunderstood it, but I posted it with you in mind, Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because you misunderstand what I am getting at. I am not suggesting that Dharma practitioners should refrain from being active in politics. I am merely suggesting that politics and Dharma do not mix.

For example, we have a Dharma practitioner who is a free market neo-liberal advocate of corporate globalization; we have another Dharma practitioner who is a conservative royalist who believes in mercantile economics; we have a Dharma practitioner who is a leftist labor social activist; and we have someone like myself, a proponent of deep ecology/left-biocentrism. We can have many more variations and flavors.

Whose politics are right? Whose politics are in line with Dharma? Whose selective point of view wrapped up in accepting and rejecting, biased opinion and limited thinking is the one that accords best with the principles of Buddha's teachings?

My point of view is that no political position is in accordance with Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Jikan said:

OK. What is the word for conduct that is based on wisdom and not on thinking and judging and choosing? How would you characterize such activity?

Malcolm wrote:

Rare.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The difference, Jikan, is that Dharma is based on wisdom, and politics is based on the limitations of thinking and judging and choosing.

M

tobes said:

This seems to me to be an arbitrary demarcation.

Unless wisdom is trapped eternally in some Platonic realm, then it must be able to interact with phenomena. If it can interact with phenomena, then it can be political.

Malcolm wrote:

It's really not hard — the purpose of Dharma is to transcend worldly entanglements like politics, power, government etc.

Politics is fundamentally about accepting and rejecting — the basis of the eight so called worldly dharmas i.e. praise/blame and so on.

So advice about conduct in Dharma, any Dharma, is ultimately about becoming free from those eight worldly dharmas.

This is why Dharma and politics are incompatible, and why, even though Dharma practitioners may act politically if they choose, they should understand that those actions are based in human ethics rather than sublime Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Uncommon Mahayana Approaches to Dealing With Desire

Content:

Ben Yuan said:

If you sense a tasty piece of food, and then in your mind later you desire that tasty piece of food, thinking of all it's good and pleasurable and gratifying qualities, you can dedicate all the pleasure of that thought to the Buddhas. Similarly, when you sense the tasty piece of food, you can dedicate the pleasure to the Buddhas, and of course, when you are eating, you can visualise yourself as offering it to the Buddhas a food offering.

Malcolm wrote:

Which just generally reinforces the idea that common Mahāyāna is not about enjoying sense pleasures for oneself, unlike Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The difference, Jikan, is that Dharma is based on wisdom, and politics is based on the limitations of thinking and judging and choosing. M

MalaBeads said:

As a statement, I would agree.

However, a query immediately comes to mind. There was plenty of Dharma, based on wisdom, in old Tibet. And yet....look what happened.

In your opinion, Malcolm, what happened there?

Malcolm wrote:

There was more counterfeit Dharma in old Tibet than authentic Dharma towards the end — mostly, but not exclusively, in the monastic establishment (in case anyone was wondering why I think the monastic system is basically defunct and not worth preserving).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

That's true but my "practice" of Dzogchen won't get too far.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

The only one placing that limitation on you is yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nyingma \neq Dzogchen.

M

heart said:

Would be interesting if you could offer some proof of that strange idea, but there seems to be nothing at all.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is snga 'gyur early translation, but then so is yoga tantra, and so on, even Vinaya.

I would say that Nyingma = Guhyagarbha -- that is the main tantra of the Nyingma school.

But the main tantra of Dzogpa Chenpo is not Guhyagarbha, it is the sgra thal gyur.

Since this is the case, really, Nyingma is a Vajrayāna school. Further, Nyingma is a gradual path school. Dzogchen is not a gradual path at all, not even a little.

We have had this discussion in various forms for years, no need to hash it out again.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma is not some objective thing independent of the world; it is a collection of truths, ideas, practices and values all of which are expressive of the way one is and ought to be in the world. In this sense, it is always and already political.

Ok, well, in this case we do not agree. Dharma is two-fold, the Dharma of realization and the Dharma of texts. What is the Dharma of realization? It is pretty straight-forward, summed up in the Lalitavistara, it is blissful, free from proliferation, luminous, permanent, etc. The Dharma of texts allows one to taste and realize that state.

Jikan said:

Hi Malcolm, I'm having a hard time understanding how this rebuts tobes' claim on conduct in the world, which (to my mind) necessarily involves integrating in all moments and in all relationships. Which means that realization must be, in this limited sense, a social phenomenon, even a collaborative one. I think I see more agreement between your position and tobes than disagreement if this exchange is taken in a bigger context.

Am I misunderstanding?

Malcolm wrote:

The difference, Jikan, is that Dharma is based on wisdom, and politics is based on the limitations of thinking and judging and choosing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

Who wrote it? Would you please give the title in Tibetan? Precious Tree (ཐཱ་ཤ་ཆེ་ལྷན་ཤིང་), Precious Wish-Granting Tree?

Malcolm wrote:

"rgyud kyi mngon par rtogs pa rin po che'i ljon shing/." In sa skya bka' 'bum. TBRC W22271. 6: 9 - 286. dehra dun: sakya center, 1992-1993.

[http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04025\\$W22271](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01CT0026%7CO01CT002600KG04025$W22271)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 18th, 2013 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

As for Dzogchen, all I can say is that in general Dzogchen practitioners are not governed by rules at all, there are no vows or samayas to follow in particular, no paths and stages, no particular conduct to adopt or reject. As long as you are mindful and not indifferent you don't need rules, vows and samayas.
You mean other than maintaining the view.

Malcolm wrote:
Not even maintaining the view is a samaya.

kirtu said:
But this is where people (Black Rudra of example) can run into trouble.

Malcolm wrote:
Tharpa Nagpo got into trouble because he had a nihilistic view, not because he had a good view.

kirtu said:
As Andreas Kreschmar has noted, around wisdom masters, everything gets enhanced.

Malcolm wrote:
And he is an authority because...?

kirtu said:
There is at least one Nyingma teaching that combines all three approaches (Sravakayana, Paramitayana and Vajrayana).
Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
Nyingma \neq Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 8:20 PM
Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:
kirtu said:
His disciples had noticed that his behavior had changed slightly and were worried about him...

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, it seems that once he had some real understanding, he wasn't such an exemplary monastic anymore...

kirtu said:
If you assert that then you have misread the story even though the story does allow

multiple readings. It wasn't until the tsok, later, that he may have violated his vows with women (although he didn't - different people spying on him saw different things - the women some saw were dakinis), after which Virupa really played up the part to avoid embarrassing his students and to provide them a lesson.

But you are correct - after some real understanding - after attaining the bhumis - he was not bound by convention.

But before attaining the bhumis, people need to continue to develop their wisdom and accumulate virtue and strictly (not legalistically) follow the training of the individual liberation precepts, their Bodhisattva Vows and very strictly keep their samaya if they practice Vajrayana. Most of the time these are not in conflict. The higher trumps the lower but most of the time the individual liberation precepts support Vajrayana conduct. As Padmasambhava said : "Our view is as high as the sky, And our conduct is as fine as barley flour."

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

There are various accounts of Virupa, and they do not all agree in particulars -- for example, one version of the mālā story holds that he threw his mālā away because he became realized. Also, there is a pun in Sanskrit that few people notice: the waste products of the body are called "mala"; a rosary is called a mālā. So when Shri Dharmapāla threw his mālā in the mala, he was making a statement about his realization i.e. since he had overcome his mala, he no longer needed his mālā.

You really need to read Rin po che ljong shing if you really want to understand the Tantric path of the Sakyapa school. In that book you will discover that in Vajrayāna (according to the Sakya school) there are three grades of heat (weak, medium, strong) on the path of application (rather than four grades as in sūtra i.e. heat, peak, etc.). Here, Vajrayāna practitioners are supposed to engage in "unconventional behavior" -- first in the their rooms, etc.

As for Dzogchen, all I can say is that in general Dzogchen practitioners are not governed by rules at all, there are no vows or samayas to follow in particular, no paths and stages, no particular conduct to adopt or reject. As long as you are not indifferent and mindful, you don't need rules, vows and samayas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 7:30 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

How can you claim that a true dharma practitioner has a conscience independent of the

dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

Meaning, they should not mistake their particular relative and conditioned views as representing THE Dharma, which is an eternal truth.

tobes said:

The Dharma is not some objective thing independent of the world; it is a collection of truths, ideas, practices and values all of which are expressive of the way one is and ought to be in the world. In this sense, it is always and already political.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, well, in this case we do not agree. Dharma is two-fold, the Dharma of realization and the Dharma of texts. What is the Dharma of realization? It is pretty straight-forward, summed up in the Lalitavistara, it is blissful, free from proliferation, luminous, permanent, etc. The Dharma of texts allows one to taste and realize that state.

tobes said:

Buddhist history clearly shows this; as do numerous nikayas and shastras.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists have acted politically, but politics and Dharma are not the same thing, and historically, political śāstras are considered "mi chos", i.e. human ethics. That is different than "lha chose" i.e. Dharma.

tobes said:

Nagarjuna did not see any contradiction between the dharma and giving robust normative political advice. Nor did the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Secular ethics and the teachings of realization are compartmentalized in the Indo-Tibetan tradition. That of course does not mean that the canon does not record Buddha's runins with kings and ministers, but what is remarkable is that in his advice to them the goals of realization always are prioritized over and against any secular value his advice could have had.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

His disciples had noticed that his behavior had changed slightly and were worried about him...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it seems that once he had some real understanding, he wasn't such an exemplary monastic anymore...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

I'm saying more that Buddhists ought to be political as an expression of Dharma

Malcolm wrote:

No, they should be political as expressions of their conscience apart from Dharma. The minute that you claim your conscience is Dharma, then you destroy the Dharma and yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

Hmmm, who else fits this? Why off the top of my head, Virupa, Nagarajuna and Atisha as well as many others including some of the other Mahasiddhas.

Have to exclude the Tibetan masters since after the establishment of Buddhism in Tibet everyone began practicing Vajrayana so this was an open secret. But otherwise many, many Tibetan masters fit this as well: the five Sakya founders, Tsongkhapa, Gampopa, and on and on.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Which Nāgārjuna? You mean the original one (2nd century CE or Rasāyāna Nāgārjuna, siddha Nagarjuna, etc. ? There simply is no possibility that all the texts ascribed to a Nāgārjuna in the bstan 'gyur are by the same person. So we really know nothing about the Nagarjuna, disciple of Saraha, who stands as a seminal Vajrayāna master, apart from the fact that he was not the same person as the Nāgārjuna who wrote the Mūlamadhyamaka-karikas. The Tibetan tradition have conflated at least three separate Nāgārjunas into one personage.

Virupa was expelled from his monastery -- that hardly sounds like "perfect outer conduct while secretly practicing Vajrayāna".

Atisha was a very nice master, but his true personae was masked by Dromton, whom Milrepa referred to as a demon.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

The danger with that logic is that no Buddhist anywhere does anything political at all, out of the humble sense that it may simply create more problems.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists can be and are political, but they ought not be political in the name of Dharma. Otherwise we have aberrations such as Sri Lanka and Burma.

gregkavarnos said:

And Tibet!

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think Tibet qualifies in the same way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

tobes said:

The danger with that logic is that no Buddhist anywhere does anything political at all, out of the humble sense that it may simply create more problems.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists can be and are political, but they ought not be political in the name of Dharma. Otherwise we have aberrations such as Sri Lanka and Burma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 17th, 2013 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Caz said:

Shantideva was a Tantric practitioner as well though, His advise is multifaceted.

Malcolm wrote:

I was discussing the Bodhicarya-avatara and the Śikṣa Sammucaya. Those two texts, as you know, are strictly common Mahāyāna.

Also we do not really know that Śantideva was a Vajrayāna practitioner, though of course there is a tradition that he was. But many such traditions are just stories, not really based in historical reality, so it is difficult to know whether they are true or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 16th, 2013 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan translator of the Samdhinirmocana sutra?

Content:

Huifeng said:

Dear lotsawas!

As title: who was the Tibetan translator of the Samdhinirmocana sutra?

Can't find the answer in any of Power's works, and don't have Lamotte's French at hand.

Thanks in advance.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

That information was not preserved in the colophon, so therefore it is not listed anywhere. This is the reason you cannot find it. Lamotte will not help you either.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 16th, 2013 at 6:32 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

But if you didn't attain the bhumis during empowerment then sutra study and practice is

good for you and is what most Tibetan masters (those whose bios I have read at least) who also didn't attain the bhumis during empowerment did.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Vajrayāna practitioner, then that is your practice — not sūtra. For example, if you read Śāntideva, then you discover the aggregates are impure. Regarding the aggregates as impure is a samaya fault in Vajrayāna, etc.

If by practicing "sutra" you mean trying to maintain the three vows without contradiction — then at least as far as the Sakya school is concerned, the higher commitments trump the lower.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 16th, 2013 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

refers primarily to the Sravaka path and is his standard introduction to Vajrayana usually just before he gives the Hevajra empowerment. It is meant as an explanation of why he is giving the empowerment to begin with.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it primarily refers to the sūtra path. Of course it is the standard preliminary to the Hevajra empowerment because the Sakya school, (at least according to how it is presented by Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen in The Wish Fulfilling Tree and Gorampa in The Sharp Weapon of Reasoning That Cuts Down False Statements Concerning Vajrayāna) does not require any training at all in sutra prior to taking Vajrayāna empowerments.

I understand that many Tibetans and their Western adherents seem to feel some sort of gradual sūtrayāna approach is required as a preliminary for Vajrayāna, but in reality, it is just not so.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 14th, 2013 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

You cannot have the physical without the mental.

Malcolm wrote:

The reverse is also true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 14th, 2013 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And then of course there is the sad fact that all of us who function as teachers and commentators of the Dharma who are not Ārya practitioners are frauds and charlatans in some sense since we are basically talking about things we have not personally experienced and of which we have only theoretical knowledge.

gregkavarnos said:

Unless we limit ourselves to just teaching about what we have personally experienced. Wouldn't really leave all that much to say, actually!

Malcolm wrote:

It could cause the Buddhist internet to experience cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 14th, 2013 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

Judging from the commodification of Buddhism, in particular Tibetan Buddhism, I would say it is readily being endorsed and appropriated by the system into a marketable and ready-made lifestyle. It is fully customizable, too, down to the selection of meditation cushions available for purchase.

Malcolm wrote:

There is Barne's and Nobles Dharma, and then there is practitioner's Dharma. Sometimes the former leads to the latter.

Indrajala said:

Yes, and I recognize that. However, with the potential for profit to be made, there is likewise the high probability that charlatans will seek such profits.

Malcolm wrote:

As you know, charlatans often are responsible for people meeting the Dharma, who then become good practitioners.

And then of course there is the sad fact that all of us who function as teachers and commentators of the Dharma who are not Ārya practitioners are frauds and charlatans in some sense since we are basically talking about things we have not personally experienced and of which we have only theoretical knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Indrajala said:

Judging from the commodification of Buddhism, in particular Tibetan Buddhism, I would say it is readily being endorsed and appropriated by the system into a marketable and ready-made lifestyle. It is fully customizable, too, down to the selection of meditation cushions available for purchase.

Malcolm wrote:

There is Barne's and Nobles Dharma, and then there is practitioner's Dharma. Sometimes the former leads to the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

MalaBeads said:

You are maintaining that the core method of Mahayana is the renunciation of sense objects while i am saying that is abandoning attachment to those objects.

Malcolm wrote:

I am maintaining that in the path of renunciation, Mahāyāna included, attachment to those desire objects [of the three realms] is abandoned by abandoning those objects themselves directly. When those objects are abandoned, attachment to them no longer arises i.e. no contact, no sensation; no sensation, no craving.

In the path of transformation it is a little different. While contact with impure material sense organs with impure material sense objects [all considered part of the upadāna rūpaskandha] results in craving, etc., contact by pure sense organs with pure objects [all transformed into a pure mandala] does not result in craving.

In the path of self-liberation, there is no need to relinquish or transform anything since [ideally] there is no grasping at all. If there is any grasping [whether internally or externally], self-liberation is not possible. Of course the path of self-liberation is a path, and therefore, there is specific way to train to reach the level of being totally free of grasping.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: Transgression, Tantra, Radical vs Conservative Buddhism

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Given that Tantra was in its historical origins, transgressive (against a Brahmin/Sattvic/dualistic Vedic society) how does/doesn't contemporary Vajrayana in the West fit into notions and attempts to upset the dominant value system of our materialist/Capitalist/postmodern/dualistic society?

Malcolm wrote:

Tantra was not transgressive. Or to put it another way; Vajrayāna tantras were no more transgressive than, for example, the Arthavaveda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Konchog1 said:

When Sonam Tsemo says "The second general topic is the Pāramitāyāna practitioner making that basis into a path by giving it up", I understand him to be saying 'the Paramitayana practitioner does not cling to the five kinds of desire objects by avoiding them'.

Which is in agreement with what I said before.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, correct. Pāramitāyāna practitioners avoid in the five desire objects in order to eliminate clinging to them.

Of course, generally we can say all Secret Mantra is a "Mahāyāna" belief.

However, you are muddying the issue: the path of general Secret Mantra is based upon "not giving up the basis" which is clearly defined as the five desire objects. Sonam Tsemo is stating that the path of mainstream Mahāyāna is "giving up the basis".

M

Konchog1 said:

I'm sorry, I'm completely lost. I agree with you. Why are we debating?

Malcolm wrote:

Its more fun than agreeing

Seriously though, since you cited the Vajrayāna section of Sonam Tsemo's text, I thought you were making an opposing argument.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Konchog1 said:

When Sonam Tsemo says "The second general topic is the Pāramitāyāna practitioner making that basis into a path by giving it up", I understand him to be saying 'the Paramitayana practitioner does not cling to the five kinds of desire objects by avoiding them'.

Which is in agreement with what I said before.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, correct. Pāramitāyāna practitioners avoid in the five desire objects in order to eliminate clinging to them.

Of course, generally we can say all Secret Mantra is a "Mahāyāna" belief.

However, you are muddying the issue: the path of general Secret Mantra is based upon "not giving up the basis" which is clearly defined as the five desire objects. Sonam Tsemo is stating that the path of mainstream Mahāyāna is "giving up the basis".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 13th, 2013 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Will said:

Putting a bag over one's head to 'renounce' the sensory object of a curvaceous lassie will not work. Nor will going to a cave that is free of such lovelies.

Konchog1 said:

Right, because the problem is that clinging arises from the mind, not from objects. If renouncing sensory objects resulted in enlightenment, then the formless gods are enlightened.

"objects are not inherently fetters; perverse thoughts based on them act as fetters."

-Sonam Tsemo, General Presentation of the Tantra Sets, 14a.4-14b.3

Edit for clarification

Of course the above quote is from the Vajrayana but I believe it expresses a Mahayana belief.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not correctly presenting Loppon Rinpoche's thought:

"The second general topic is the Pāramitāyāna practitioner making that basis into a path by giving it up."

-- The General Presentation of the Divisions of Tantra folio 12/a.

Clearly in this treatise he is claiming two things there is a basis to be given up, and he defines that basis as the five desire objects:

"If it is asked what that cause is, it becomes many things when analyzed extensively — aggregates [skandha], elements [dhātu], gateways [āyatana], etc. In brief it is the five kinds of desire objects. If is wondered how is it summarized into five; the creator of samsara and nirvana is the mind. Its objects are six or twelve, but all are just the five [desire objects] themselves and what follows those, apart from which there isn't anything else. Therefore, these five are the basis."

-- folio 11/a

He later states:

"... as such, if is wondered whether the basis of samsara and nirvana is shared or separate, it is shared.

Now, if one thinks "Doesn't the one who wishes nirvana give up the basis? If that is so, [the basis] cannot be shared."

Indeed, it is true [the basis, i.e. the five desire objects] is given up. Since it is necessary to make [the basis which is] given up itself into an object, since that is so, [the basis] is also proven to be the basis of nirvana."

Thus, your citation (which comes in the section where secret mantra is defined through the fact that it does not give up the basis [the five desire objects]) cannot be understood in the manner in which you are citing it because it directly contradicts the intention of the author, irrespective of what you personally believe to be the intention of Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Some educational posts on Tibetan History:

"Tibetan intransigence persuaded the British to give up their exploratory mission into Tibet. Instead Britain secured China's recognition of its military takeover of Burma, and reciprocated by recognizing China's claim of suzerainty over Tibet.

Tibetans were deliberately excluded from all the conventions and discussions that took place in those years between the British and China concerning Tibet or Sikkim. In 1893 when the Trade Regulation talks were held in Darjeeling, the Tibetan cabinet sent a senior official, Paljor Dorje Shatra to keep an eye on the proceedings. Shatra's presence appears to have been resented by the British. Some English subalterns dragged him off his horse and threw him into a public fountain in the Chowrasta square."

<http://www.jamyangnorbu.com/blog/2013/02/13/a-brief-overview-of-events-that-led-to-the-13th-dalai-lama%E2%80%99s-proclamation-of-tibetan-independence>

"Tibetans can legitimately view the events from 1876 to 1904 as the first chapter in their modern history. Most accounts of this period, largely written by British officials or scholars tend to downplay native resistance and patriotism and ascribe them instead to Tibetan religious fanaticism."

<http://www.jamyangnorbu.com/blog/2013/02/06/backstory-to-the-13th-dalai-lamas-declaration-of-independence>

"Academic scholarship may not generally lend itself to moving or inspirational writing, but there are exceptions. Edward Gibbon's, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, is probably the greatest work of history written in the English language (Hugh Trevor-Roper) and a literary masterpiece praised for its narrative clarity, biting irony and elegant prose. It was a book that woke people up to a whole new way of viewing antiquity, especially in relation to the development of religious institutions – the Christian church in particular. It was also the defining work of history that came out of the European Enlightenment.

Tsepon Wangchuk Deden Shakabpa's *Advanced Political History of Tibet* deals with events, places and personalities that have, of course, less resonance or significance to the rest of the world, especially at the moment when China is being hailed internationally as the next global superpower, and the issue of Tibet has been relegated to a kind of oblivion, more distant and inconsequential (it sometimes appears) than a chariot race at the Hippodrome in ancient Constantinople."

<http://www.jamyangnorbu.com/blog/2011/12/06/shakabpa-and-the-awakening-of-tibetan-history/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When the householder bodhisattva possesses three Dharmas, having stayed at home, until perfect unsurpassed awakening, he never enjoys the five desire objects, and in that way develops the root of virtue.

Trisambaranirdeśaparivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Because of this sūtra in the past, having abandoned the five desire objects, I will always take the [Mahāyāna] vows [samvara] at the six times.

Ārya-prabhāsādhana-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Astus said:

Not enjoying a sunset is not the same as not seeing a sunset. So, what is abandoned is attachment and desire, not the sense data. Even when contemplating the foulness of the body the point is not to see no bodies at all but not to see it as desirable.

Malcolm wrote:

The point of taking a vow of celibacy is not to allow contact of your penis with a vagina., etc.

Anyway, I could spend my time and find many citations that prove that in terms of Mahāyāna view and conduct, the five desire objects themselves are something to be abandoned for many reasons, some having to do with becoming free from attachment, others having to do with the developing samadhi, etc. But I am going to stop here because I have clearly made my point about why Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna differ on the point of eliminating contact with desire objects themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

why is this so hard to understand?

M

MalaBeads said:

Because understanding is not the whole of practice, Malcolm. Because we have body, speech and mind. Because if the three are not integrated, then there is no realization of what is being taught.

Malcolm wrote:

You are totally missing the point. We are discussing why Mahāyāna is a path of renunciation. We are not discussing integration in terms of how that is presented in Dzogchen teachings, not at all. Mahāyāna conduct is completely based on abandoning sense objects, as we can see from many citations. It is critical to understand this point.

When we say that Mahāyāna is a path of renunciation, we are saying we are abandoning the five desire objects, because that is how we are going to abandon attachment to them. The Vajrayāna path of transformation exists for people who are too weak to abandon the five desire objects because their craving is so strong.

It is really simple: the links of dependent origination in this life function in this way -->

contact [sparśa] --> sensation [vedana] -- craving [trṣṇā] --> addiction [upādāna] -->

The easiest way stop craving is to sever contact with a given sense object, for example, an alcoholic and alcohol.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

to give up attachment to the five desire objects, the five desire objects themselves are given up as part of the path.

Honestly, why is this so hard to understand?

Astus said:

Because it means, as I read it from your words, that one gives up what is seen, heard, smelled, tasted and touched. That is, the person becomes completely insensitive and incorporeal. I doubt that either sravakas or bodhisattvas would aim for that.

Malcolm wrote:

When the householder bodhisattva possesses three Dharmas, having stayed at home, until perfect unsurpassed awakening, he never enjoys the five desire objects, and in that way develops the root of virtue.

Trisambaranirdeśaparivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Because of this sūtra in the past, having abandoned the five desire objects, I will always take the [Mahāyāna] vows [samvara] at the six times.

Ārya-prabhāsādhana-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I disagree it is not the path of renouncing sense objects, but the path of renouncing attachment to sense objects. If they renounce sense objects, they would not be eating and drinking.

Exactly, we have to understand what the spang bya (ཤང་བྱ་) is, the object of abandonment. It is not the sense object themselves but the attachment and other delusions that arise connected with those sense objects.

Malcolm wrote:

Śariputra: likewise, bodhisattva mahāsattvas welled trained in the illusions of Mahāyāna attain the experience of illusory phenomena. Though free from all afflictions, they enjoy the five desire objects [pañcakāmaguṇa] from the perspective of great compassion in order to ripen sentient beings to be disciplined, but they do not associate with those [five desire objects], they are not moved by those.

Śariputra: bodhisattva mahāsattvas describe the faults of desire objects with many similes: desire objects are a conflagration. Desire objects are totally inferior. Desire objects are murderers. Desire objects are enemies. Desire objects are invaders. Desire objects are like straw huts. Desire objects are like the kimpakā fruit. Desire objects are like the edge of a razor. Desire objects are like cinders. Desire objects are like poison leaves. Desire objects are like sparrows. Desire objects are like cesspools.

As such, Śariputra, though bodhisattva mahāsattvas comprehend desire objects thoroughly, for the purpose of ripening sentient beings who lack skillful means, [they] are remorseful from the five desire objects, and in order to free those [sentient beings] from the five desire objects, [bodhisattva mahāsattvas] expound upon [the faults] of the five desire objects in detail.

-- Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā

The point, dear friends, is that in Mahāyāna, just as in Śravakayāna, order to give up attachment to the five desire objects, the five desire objects themselves are given up as part of the path. This is why in Vajrayāna tradition, common Mahāyāna [as opposed to uncommon Mahāyāna Vajrayāna] is clearly described as a path of renunciation because it is a path of renunciation.

Honestly, why is this so hard to understand?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 11:45 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

MalaBeads said:

= It is impossible to abandon all sense objects unless you are dead.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not the case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 11:30 AM

Title: Re: How do Tibetans Rationalize the Tibetan Genocide?

Content:

Indrajala said:

I've never heard a Tibetan blame the bad political decisions of the Tibetan government for what happened (maybe they'd see that as insulting to HHDL).

Malcolm wrote:

You haven't been paying attention then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 11:28 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

MalaBeads said:

Quite so. Attachment is the problem not sense objects.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and the essence of paths of renunciation is abandoning sense objects in order to eliminate attachments. That, after all, is the point of paths of renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

mitsuk said:

Greg, I may be wrong but I think you read the phonetic kama as corresponding to pali kamma (skt karma). What Pero (and Malcolm) were talking about is bKa'-ma (phonetized as *kama). bKa' ma is a collection of orally transmitted works which were put into written form (or more precisely compiled and edited) by Lochen Dharma sri and Terdak Lingpa. It is supposed to contain works orally (bka') transmitted since the 8th century in tibetan language. Terma teachings are or should be in harmony with the teachings of Kama (bKa' ma), as a demonstration of their canonicity.

Malcolm wrote:

For example, the Guhyagarbha is kama, shidro is Terma. Both have the mandala of peaceful and wrathful deities; the authority for the latter rests on the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Ramon1920 said:

Three things come to mind with regards to dealing with desire, they all are activities of giving proper attention: Benefits and disadvantages, the false appearance, and the internal feelings (winds if you will).

[...]

Konchog1 said:

While this is all true, its more in line with Theravada. Whereas this is a Mahayana forum.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a classic Mahāyāna formulation:

Objects and poisons are alike, pleasing just when first tasted.

Objects and poisons are alike, their result is unpleasant and unbearable.

Objects and poisons are alike, causing one to be clouded by the darkness of ignorance.

Objects and poisons are alike, their power is hard to reverse, and deceptive, etc...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 12th, 2013 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Astus said:

The topic is about dealing with desires, and you restrict Mahayana to a single approach that desires can only be rejected. My position is that Mahayana is more than that and encompasses several methods.

"For the bodhisattva, afflictions accord with his nature.

He is not one who takes nirvāṇa as his very nature.

It is not the case that the burning up of the afflictions

Allows one to generate the seed of bodhi."

(Nagarjuna: Guide to the Bodhisattva Path, v. 79)

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a refutation of my point. This is merely an sectarian observation that standard presentation of the śrāvaka path is not a path that results in the generation of full buddhahood.

As for your other points -- the path of Mahāyāna really no different than that of śravakayāna -- and is a path based on the renunciation of sense objects and has no other path than that.

You can dance on books all day and you will never alter this fact. I can give you a hundred citations from the very sutras and texts you cite [that the bodhisattva path is path of renouncing sense objects], and still you will never retreat from your point of view.

It is good that you are devoted to prajñāpāramitā, but the pāramitā path just a path of renouncing sense objects.

I will leave it here — The Sāgaramatipariṣcchā-sūtra states:

"Bodhisattvas who possess prajñā are to be reproached about the accumulation of merit; without the method, they do not endeavor in generosity, discipline, patience, diligence and concentration. They indulge in proliferation, thinking 'the perfection of prajñā is extraordinarily supreme, the other perfections are inferior'."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 11th, 2013 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Your teacher is a tertön and terma are (currently) the penultimate expression of the modification and transformation of the Buddhist corpus. Much more so than commentaries since terma are considered the direct manifestation of the wisdom of enlightened beings (like the old "Thus I have heard" of the Mahayana Sutras).

Malcolm wrote:

Greg:

If termas are the manifestation of the wisdom of an awakened person, what can be more conservative than this?

Apart from that, termas must correspond to kama. If they do not, they are not termas. Termas are not meant to be innovative, they are meant restorative.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 11th, 2013 at 7:47 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a statement about means.

Astus said:

Prajnaparamita is the basis of the bodhisattvayana, and there are no methods to apply without it. It is prajnaparamita that liberates all beings and it includes all means. Isn't the inseparability of compassion and wisdom the essential realisation of a bodhisattva?

Malcolm wrote:

No, Astus -- bodhicitta is the basis of the bodhisattvayāna, and that has both relative and ultimate aspects.

Your bodhisattvayāna is a bird that is wounded in one wing.

In any event, this stream of replies and responses is far away from the original point, which is that Mahāyāna is a path of renunciation, just like Śrāvakayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 11th, 2013 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Astus said:

...that the afflictions are not rejected but they are actually required.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not how I understand the passage.

Astus said:

You don't change afflictions, you train in pure vision. By slowly transforming your vision, since ordinary vision is caused by afflictions which generate concepts, counteract that with sadhana practice, completion stage etc.

You use afflictions just as they are, but by changing how you relate to the world, by transforming your world, slowly you realize the state of Mahāmudra without giving anything up at all.

With establishing prajnaparamita as the correct view there is nothing to improve or get rid of.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a statement about means.

Astus said:

As it says in chapter 22 in PP8000, purification means simply the extent one uses prajnaparamita. To this you may say that this is again the ultimate view, and that in order to reach that one has to follow a sravaka-style practice by renouncing the world, etc. As I see it, to hop on the Great Vehicle, one needs prajnaparamita (ch. 1, PP8000).

Malcolm wrote:

Pāramitāyāna is a gradual path, one that requires infinite lifetimes to complete. If you are a very fortunate person close to your last rebirth, you might be able to hop on the Prajñāpāramitā express, but in reality we can see that this is not the case for most sentient beings.

We all have prajñā, but whether than prajñā has been brought to the level of being a pāramitā is completely another question.

Astus said:

This is how prajnaparamita is a universal solution for all defilements, because it removes the root of the problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, prajñā takes many eons to perfect according to Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Wait a second, a few posts ago you were going to town on Ven Indrajala saying that if he didn't stick to the rules exactly as they are laid down then he was contravening them and not a proper monastic and now you say that one has to use ones intelligence in regard to the rules. So which is it to be?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not do the former. Where Jeff and I disagree is that over whether the basic rules of monastics can be altered. I don't think so.

If you don't want to follow all the rules of a Bhikṣu as best as you can -- then don't become a bhikṣu, that is what I am saying. Indrajala is basically saying that he feels that the only ordination that is necessary is the śrāmanera or novice ordination. He is also saying Vinaya should be revised to reflect that.

There is certainly an avenue for people to only receive the dge tshul ordination. Many very high lamas only ordain up to that level, for example. But I don't think the Vinaya rules should be revised, and it is unlikely they will be in Theravada and Mulasarvastivada since that would require a council of Vinayadharas and I just don't think it will happen (as it shouldn't).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is, the cultural revolution in Tibet was largely carried out by Tibetans.

anjali said:

Hmm. Willingly, or under duress (more like the French in Nazi occupied France during WWII)?

Malcolm wrote:

Willingly. It was Tibetan cadres that carried out the most brutal actions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In many places being celibate is considered very strange and weird. So are you saying Buddhist monks should abandon celibacy in such places?

M

Indrajala said:

No, because, as I said above, liberation via renunciation requires celibacy. You cannot transcend the kāma-dhātu via dhyāna without abandoning kāma, which requires abstaining from sense desires, most importantly sexual activities and thoughts. This is to say nothing of reaching the rūpa-dhātu and ārūpya-dhātu, both of which must be reached and transcended via conventional dhyāna. Even just the first dhyāna requires abandonment of sense desires. How much more so the other three?

This is why I said the expectation of celibacy is non-negotiable, so to speak. Celibacy and the traditional śramaṇa path go hand in hand.

Malcolm wrote:

You see, your example does not really work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

At a certain point, the pratimokṣa was settled.

Indrajala said:

That's not entirely true. The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya as translated by Yijing during the Tang displays explicit Mahāyāna elements: mention of the Mahāyāna path in contrast to that of the śrāvaka-s, buddhas in the plural and bodhisattvas. This is significant because it demonstrates, at least around Nalanda where it came from, the Vinaya was fair game for revision, even centuries after the main Vinaya texts were supposed to have been settled.

Malcolm wrote:

The pratimokṣa was settled. Commentaries on it may not have been, and the supporting texts may have been expanded.

Gunaprabha's Vinaya sutra is really the basis for the MS vinaya as it is practiced today.

This Vinaya, as it stands in the bka' 'gyur displays no such references AFAIK.

Of course texts change, since they are not fixed in stone, and are modified to reflect the interest of their readers. It is not surprising there are Mahāyāna elements in some Vinaya recensions somewhere, since there were a lot of monks of Mahāyāna persuasion.

We have not addressed the issue, thus far, of the Bodhisattva pratimokṣa, which in my view is the primary valid basis for modifying one's pratimokṣa vows.

But I really do not share your view that monks ought to just ignore vows they think are unnecessary. Monks depend on lay people. Monastic comportment was designed as much to discipline monks as it was to make lay people comfortable with monks so they would support them.

I expect monks that I support to follow Vinaya. Otherwise, I have no interest in supporting them, either in spirit or financially.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They were rules set down by the Buddha. They should be respected and preserved, not tossed away out of convenience.

Indrajala said:

We should not overlook statements like the following as found in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya which states, "Even if it be something I have prohibited, if it is not considered pure [conduct] in other lands, then it all should not be adopted. Even if it is not something I have prohibited, if something must be carried out in other lands, then it all must be carried out."

Malcolm wrote:

In many places being celibate is considered very strange and weird. So are you saying Buddhist monks should abandon celibacy in such places?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is obvious that renunciate paths (as opposed to the general dissatisfaction with samsara) are less possible then before. Actually, it is easier to be dissatisfied with samsara now, but it is much less easy to do something about it.

gregkavarnos said:

I disagree. Given the current proliferation of Dharma in the West and the willingness for people to engage with spiritual traditions outside of the Judeo-Christian framework (especially after the 1960's) I would say that for westerners it is now actually easier to "do something about it".

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma might be proliferating in Europe and Russia, in the US it has become a little bit moribund, its growth has slowed markedly.

gregkavarnos said:

Another point that I do not understand: you seem totally opposed to the alteration (mainly removal of irrelevant rules) of the Vinaya code, yet you are happy to see the changes (mainly additions) imposed on monastics; changes which were made during the historical course of the development of the Vinaya. Why?

Malcolm wrote:

At a certain point, the pratimokṣa was settled. It was clearly settled after Buddha's famous statement. We don't know exactly when. Nevertheless, we have the pratimokṣa we do. Elsewhere I noted that a monastic Sangha is not vital to the survival of the Dharma since Sikhin, for example, had no monastic Sanagha. Many Buddhas had/have/will have retinues, but no Sangha of monks.

gregkavarnos said:

Given you accept changes in the form of additions why do you not accept subtractions (or modifications)? What makes this even stranger is that your current teacher is actually quite opposed to ossification and very much in support of development, innovation and modification. Is this purposeful reticence on your behalf?

Malcolm wrote:

My current teacher is the most conservative Dzogchen teacher alive, actually. He is even more conservative than Chatral Sangye Dorje. Why? Because he teaches Dzogchen that way Garab Dorje said to teach Dzogchen, not the way Tibetan Lamas say to teach Dzogchen.

gregkavarnos said:

I ask this because (for example) a monastic living in a Western urban environment will be unable to procure cow dung and urine to purify their dwelling after eating garlic, so maybe changing the clause so that the monastic can use air freshener wouldn't be a tragic loss to the Vinaya transmission (or count as a downfall)? Otherwise, it seems to me, that you are purposefully setting up the system for failure.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a question of being intelligent -- one can understand that having eaten garlic, one needs to mask the odor. One infers intention and use one's intelligence. The downfall is not failing to use cowdung, it is consuming garlic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 11:12 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Pero said:

So why become a monk then? Why are there monks if that's all there is to it?

Indrajala said:

Bear in mind for the first five years there were no precepts. The first disciples of the Buddha received neither precepts nor vows. So, at one point there were completely legitimate śramaṇa disciples of the Buddha with no precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

You did not answer the question.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so for you a bodhisattva is solely someone who has realized emptiness. Well, that certainly does leave a lot of people out.

Astus said:

"if a bodhisattva holds the notion of a self, the notion of person, the notion of sentient being, and the notion of life span, then she is not a bodhisattva." (Diamond Sutra, ch. 17, tr. C. Muller)

Malcolm wrote:

Again with the ultimate truth thing -- it is a pity the Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra was only translated into Chinese in 1930.

Astus said:

So while I don't make the difference here between ordinary and noble bodhisattvas, it is with the intention to show that the bodhisattvayana, as presented by the sutras and several teachers, is not just how it tends to be represented in later "sudden teaching" texts (i.e. as something that only incompetent fools choose over their direct path to buddhahood).

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, you are presenting a very one-sided view. We all understand, since "Dharma" kindergarten, that the Vajracchedhika sūtra presents a very definitive view of prajñāpāramitā, beginning with dānapāramitā. Mahāyāna does not just exist as a teaching on ultimate truth.

Astus said:

If "phenomena themselves" are afflictive, then are phenomena should be removed or the afflictions? If ignorance lies in appearances then shouldn't the realm of nothingness or complete annihilation be nirvana? As I understand it, the problem is with believing appearances to be self, and that's why the realisation of emptiness is the solution.

Malcolm wrote:

Phenomena, as you well know, are afflictive because they are conducive to suffering and are suffering. The path of renunciation suggests, in both Nikaya schools as well as Mahāyāna, that phenomena are to be removed -- and this is generally accomplished with vows. For example, monks remove the phenomena of others' genitals; they remove the phenomena of handling precious things. More importantly, the abandonment of sense objects is seen as a condition for development of samadhi in both Nikāya Buddhism and Mahāyāna. Ask anyone around here.

Astus said:

They are like illusions because they are empty, and seeing things as empty only means non-attachment but not annihilation. Why do you say then that they are abandoned?

Malcolm wrote:

They are abandoned because they are no longer a basis for effluents when emptiness is realized.

Astus said:

"you should understand that all the afflictions constitute the seed of the Tathāgata. It is like not being able to attain the priceless jewelpearl without entering the ocean.

Therefore, if one does not enter the great sea of the afflictions, one will not be able to attain the jewel of omniscience." (Vimalakirti Sutra, ch. 8, tr. McRae)

This sutra says...

Malcolm wrote:

...nothing of the sort. The citation you provide is no different than the peacock eating poisoned plants metaphor. The passage in question as read from the Tibetan states:

"For example, in a desert, flowers such as the blue poppy, padma, jasmine, pundarika, and the saugandhikam will not grow, but the blue poppy, padma, jasmine, pundarika, and the saugandhikam will grow in a swamp or an island. Likewise, buddhadharmas will not grow in sentient beings who have attained the certainty of the unconditioned, but buddhadharmas will grow in sentient beings who have become swamps and islands of afflictions.

Seeds will not grow in space, but will grow when placed in the ground. Likewise, buddhadharmas will not grow in sentient beings who have attained the certainty of the unconditioned, but having generated a view of a perishable assembly [satkāyadrṣṭi] equal [in size] with Sumeru, from that buddhadharmas will grow.

Son of a good family, with these similes, all afflictions should be known as the tathāgata gotra [rīgs]. Just as one can never reach a priceless jewel without entering the ocean, likewise, without entering the ocean of afflictions, omniscience will never grow from that."

When you use citations, you must comment based on the actual sense of the passage, not merely produce it in a sort of "dancing on books" kind of a way. Before you produce a citation, it is best to check if it is accurate. This citation definitely is mistranslated.

Here gotra does not mean seed — it never means "seed". It means "protection or shelter for cows , cow-pen , cow-shed , stable for cattle , stable (in general) , hurdle , enclosure" and secondarily, "family , race , lineage , kin" -- here it is obvious that the former meaning is more intended than the latter.

Here, it is very clear that it is container/contained metaphor. But what this incorrect citation is saying is that the field is the seed. What you are suggesting is an identity proposition. That is the completely wrong way to understand this passage.

Afflictions are the field, the enclosure, in which tathāgatas are grown. In this sutra, afflictions are not themselves omniscience. Afflictions are the ocean, the enclosure,

within which is held the priceless jewel, omniscience,.

Here, the intention of this passage is to compare bodhisattvas conduct (who is not afraid of afflictions) with the conduct of śravakas who attain certainty in nirvana. Bodhisattvas here are not afraid to continue taking rebirth in samsara [enter the ocean] while they accumulate the qualities of omniscience [the priceless jewel]. But this passage is not saying "Afflictions are omniscience", for example.

Even more importantly, the passage is arguing that even having a sense of self is to be preferred to having realized selflessness in terms of being fearless about cultivating omniscience.

The passage as a whole is a Mahāyāna sectarian passage condemning "main stream" buddhists for being cowardly.

Astus said:

You don't use afflictions on the path of transformation just as they are...

Malcolm wrote:

Really?

The Vajrapañjara-tantra states: Created by passion, the worldly shall be liberated by the same passion.

Śrī Guhyasamāja The passionate desiring wisdom always rely on the five desire objects

Śrī Hevajra-tantra states: The savage actions of people bring bondage by such and such;

If one possesses the method, by just those [actions] one shall be liberated from the bondage of becoming

Śrī Guhyasamāja: All the desired pleasures are what one serves with desire;

make offerings to oneself and others with the yoga of oneself as the deity

You don't change afflictions, you train in pure vision. By slowly transforming your vision, since ordinary vision is caused by afflictions which generate concepts, counteract that with sadhana practice, completion stage etc.

As The Hevajra states: Since the poison has been eliminated by purification, these objects to be relied upon are reliable

You use afflictions just as they are, but by changing how you relate to the world, by transforming your world, slowly you realize the state of Mahāmudra without giving anything up at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Liberation Unleashed in the POV of Dzogchen

Content:

Tenpa said:

What intrigues me is whether its method have a correlation with Dzogchen's Pointing Out?. Is now a time where traditional method such as preliminaries and all of its samaya all being by-passed?

Malcolm wrote:

None whatsoever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

This organization isn't marked by "spectacular failure"

Malcolm wrote:

Monastically, yes, it is -- and that is all I was talking about.

They could take some of the millions raised set aside for building a huge statue, for example, and build a monastic college in say Idaho.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 10th, 2013 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Astus said:

Bodhisattvas have no trouble with samsara because they understand how afflictions are enlightenment, it is not some abstract far away goal but the path itself, because a bodhisattva practises prajnaparamita.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so for you a bodhisattva is solely someone who has realized emptiness. Well, that certainly does leave a lot of people out.

Astus said:

As above, the dharmas need not be rejected or removed. Even in Theravada it is taught that the problem is not with the skandhas but with attachment ("I-making and mine-

making").

Malcolm wrote:

No, in terms of relative truth Mahāyāna teaches that phenomena themselves are afflictive. Also in the Nikāya schools, phenomena themselves are regarded as afflictive and a cause of suffering.

Astus said:

It is with the realisation of emptiness that one can walk the bodhisattva path itself. If there were "subtle and not so subtle accepting and rejecting" then how could it be non-abiding?

Malcolm wrote:

As I noted above, you are making the claim that only those who have realized emptiness can "walk the bodhisattva path". Of course this is totally false. It's great if you have realized emptiness. If you can truly speak from that point of view, if you, like "Geshe" Michael Roach, have truly realized emptiness, how wonderful. I rejoice in your realization! I want to be your student! But if not, then you are just spewing hot air which is not practical at all, and not only does not relate to your own state, but it does not relate the state of others.

In reality the intent of such statements that you introduced is that in Mahāyāna, the contemplation of the emptiness is for abandoning sense objects.

The victor stated that desire objects, wealth and the three planes of existence are similar to illusions, mirages, a moon in the water, and apparitions.

Or for example, when we examples of Aryādharma and Sadaprarudita have parties with many women and so on, at this point these bodhisattvas are already past the point of darśana marga. But common Mahāyāna offers no methods for ordinary persons to take sense objects in to the path.

How do ordinary Mahāyāna practitioners practice? For the most part their practice is no different than that of non-Mahāyāna Buddhists. i.e. śīla, samadhi and prajñā.

Only their view is a little different, with a slightly more liberal attitude towards vows. The fault in your argument lies in not making a distinction between aryabodhisattvas and regular bodhisattvas, those who have not realized prajñāpāramitā.

Astus said:

Is there still attachment on the path of transformation and self-liberation? If yes, then how can it be called transformation and self-liberation? If no, it also abandons attachment.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is attachment on the path of transformation. There is attachment on the

path of transformation until there is realization. Then the path changes. At that point, there is no more attachment. Attachment is used on the path transformation to eliminate attachment. Desire is used to eliminate desire, etc.

The path of self-liberation is a little difference since self-liberation is non-attachment (but it is not so simple as that).

Astus said:

Therefore, saying that renunciation is less possible than before is a statement valid only for those who want to practise something else.

Malcolm wrote:

It is obvious that renunciate paths (as opposed to the general dissatisfaction with samsara) are less possible then before. Actually, it is easier to be dissatisfied with samsara now, but it is much less easy to do something about it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

But I am gonna stick to causes and conditions as explanation for everything that happens.

By itself, that doesn't seem flippant.

It's because of the prior statement about the Tibetans not having the merit to "dodge" the cultural revolution...

makes the sentence above seem strange, dismissive perhaps.

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing is, the cultural revolution in Tibet was largely carried out by Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Yes, because Buddhist monasticism aka the order of bhikṣus, has seen its day. Now, if Buddhist lay people wish to create retreat centers, and even cloistered community, that is fine and dandy -- but they won't be Buddhist monks [even though these days many such people in such places are laboring under the delusion that they are "monks" all the while being married, etc.]. This is why the appellation "minister" is more useful. One can

be a Buddhist religious professional without calling oneself a "monk". I.e. one can be a Buddhist minister.

But Malcolm surely with the amount of reading you have done you know that many texts say after the bhikshu Sangha has disappeared the dharma is at its end. Do you feel that these are simply provisional teachings, or that this is not the case with secret mantra?

Malcolm wrote:

I feel it is along the lines of statements like "Only this day of Śakyamuni's teaching is secret mantra teachings available..." etc -- a completely provisional statement since I have seen interesting corrections of this in various places. All Buddhas can teach secret mantra.

JKhedrup said:

Secondly, I have no problem with Buddhist ministers but I am little wary of any titles. Why? Because in the West we have people who use titles like shoulderpads (from the 80s) to puff up their credentials and stature when actually they have very little knowledge and capacity as teachers. We see how disastrous this is with Western Buddhist organizations who send people out to serve the guru's mission after less than a year of study and practice.

Malcolm wrote:

We see people becoming bhikṣus mainly to get a leg up in Buddhist hierarchy. And yes, there are problems with anything like this.

JKhedrup said:

It is very frustrating on the ground at times, let me tell you.

Malcolm wrote:

I agree with everything you say. The main point of being a teacher is not running one's mouth -- that is what we have the internet for. The main point of being a teacher is that you are helping people free themselves.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Jnana said:

It seems to me that the capacities and shared vision of the community members and the abilities of the community leaders are among the most important factors that contribute to the success of any given community.

Indrajala said:

When a community is up and coming without widespread support from society, then of

course the leadership and common vision are essential for anything to happen. This is perhaps the most difficult aspect of developing Buddhism in the west. Without the right people, then there's not even general social support to fall back on to keep things above the water line.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because Buddhist monasticism aka the order of bhikṣus, has seen its day. Now, if Buddhist lay people wish to create retreat centers, and even cloistered community, that is fine and dandy -- but they won't be Buddhist monks [even though these days many such people in such places are laboring under the delusion that they are "monks" all the while being married, etc.]. This is why the appellation "minister" is more useful. One can be a Buddhist religious professional without calling oneself a "monk". I.e. one can be a Buddhist minister.

Indrajala said:

We just need to keep things simple. If you're a śramaṇa, remain single and celibate. Behave yourself. Speak the truth, speak well, speak clearly. Try to emulate the Buddha as best you can.

This ideal isn't necessarily incompatible with vinaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Jnana/Indrajala: this does not have the force of the vow.

Indrajala said:

For various reasons though a lot of Buddhists are unwilling to consider modifications to the formal Vinaya systems, even when they admit not everything can or will be followed in the present day. The sacrosanct quality of it is remarkable despite it really being house rules aimed primarily at irresponsible young men and women.

Malcolm wrote:

They were rules set down by the Buddha. They should be respected and preserved, not tossed away out of convenience.

Indrajala said:

Personally, I don't feel I need to hold myself to account for silly things some people apparently did twenty-five centuries ago in rural Magadha.

Malcolm wrote:

Bhikṣus have a responsibility to uphold their vows. Whether they do or not is up to them, of course.

Indrajala said:

What's really striking is the literature which outlines in detail the long years that will be spent in hell for violating even minor precepts. You can go to hell for immeasurable years if you eat yeast and fail to confess it according to the authors. Quite terrifying and

ghoulish punishments await he who eats yeast or brewer's lees and fails to confess the sin.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because that person took a vow not to do something. If he or she willfully ignores it, then yes, of course, if this person does not attain stream entry, who knows where they will wind up. But secondly these kinds of things are part of Indian commentarial hyperbole intended to make the person understand it is really important even to follow minor rules as best one can and confess them if one does not.

Indrajala said:

Again, this leads me more and more to agree with Jizang's conclusion. In both Indian and Chinese literature I see a lot of logical inconsistencies and easily refuted metaphysical speculations.

Malcolm wrote:

Vows are intentions. We don't need the theory of avijñāpti, etc. When you take a vow, you make an intention to follow that vow. Except, apparently in this day and age, people take vows with no intention of following them at all.

To be a Dharma person, the essence of vinaya is non-harming, the essence of Mahāyāna is bodhicitta, and the essence of Vajrayāna is pure vision -- one does not need to take many vows at all follow this -- but if someone takes vows, they should try to follow them. If they can't follow them, they should not take them.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 7:21 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

jeeprs said:

You'd be mad to abandon all that, wouldn't you?

Indrajala said:

Some of us are just eccentric.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I really consider bhikṣus with credit cards to be renunciates... [not].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 7:19 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

Taking sense objects "into" the path[/i] (is that separate? Is that what you meant?) is distinct from that/can be a skilful means. What does that look like in a practical sense? (in postmeditation, I mean).

Malcolm wrote:

Yoga of passion, eating, washing, wearing clothes, maintaining post-equipose pure view of all appearances, sound and thoughts deity, mantra and wisdom, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A very short one, in terms of liturgy, and a solitary deity, rather than a complicated mandala, for example, the Phyag rgya gcig ma form of Vajrakīlaya from Choling Tersar, or Solitary Heruka Yamantaka, etc.

Konchog1 said:

But do short Sadhanas have the full benefit? I thought they just existed so busy people could fulfill their practice requirements.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on your view and tradition -- in general, for example, in Sakya, longer sadhanas are considered to be for beginners.

In Nyingma however, a short sadhana is considered all that is necessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Nilasarasvati said:

...are you saying essentially that it's unrealistic for laypeople to really abandon sense pleasures and they should just take the desire as the path/trust that sadhana to slowly dissolve obscurations? [/b]

Malcolm wrote:

It is unrealistic for lay people (and even bhikṣus) to abandon sense pleasures in this day and age, therefore, it is best to use a method where sense pleasures are used for one's own purposes as part of the path, hence the reason for the Vajrayāna path of transformation. Of course if you do not have Vajrayāna methods you try and be free from

accepting and rejecting ala Chan and Zen, but that is a slow path since it lacks skill methods, from a Vajrayāna perspective.

I should add, no one takes desire [or the other afflictions] as a path except for people who wish to continue to cycle in samsara. One can take sense objects into the path through using the sadhana method if you did not achieve liberation through receiving empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Malcolm, drinking wine is a violation of a basic Buddhist precept. Can one intentionally also break the other four and still able to gain some type of enlightenment in Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Drinking wine is not a violation of five precepts, getting intoxicated is.

As far as the the other four precepts, they must be observed by everyone. Of course, when one becomes sufficiently mature, one ceases to wish to kill, steal, lie or engage in sexual misconduct, and even, become intoxicated.

Vasubandhu's opinion that madana means even a single drop of alcohol is highly debatable.

Nighthawk said:

What type of daily Vajrayana sadhana would you recommend for someone with a busy schedule?

Malcolm wrote:

A very short one, in terms of liturgy, and a solitary deity, rather than a complicated mandala, for example, the Phyag rgya gcig ma form of Vajrakilaya from Choling Tersar, or Solitary Heruka Yamantaka, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 9th, 2013 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

Ideally. You're just telling me what the manual says, not how real life works.

Malcolm wrote:

In real life, when you have a vow not to kill, and you kill, the demerit is stronger, much stronger, than if you did not have such a vow. The merit of refraining from killing is likewise much stronger

Indrajala said:

If you want to be a śramaṇa and behave like one, then you're a śramaṇa, i.e., a monk. If you're a student of the Buddha's teachings, you're a Buddhist monk. You don't need anyone's consent or acknowledgement to be a śramaṇa.

Malcolm wrote:

To be a Buddhist śramanera, in fact you do. Otherwise, one is merely engaging in personal fabrications.

Indrajala said:

And all their preceptors and their own going back twenty-some centuries were all having intact vows?

Malcolm wrote:

In the case of Tibetan ordination lineages, this is the case. I can't speak about those in other transmissions.

Indrajala said:

You once said samaya is a social construct. How can you argue that while saying ordination is not?

Malcolm wrote:

Ordination has no meaning outside of its social context, just like Samaya. Just like Samaya, it too is a tradition, a transmission, from awakened people. Like samaya, ordination is a species of contract between the one who imparts the vow and the vow holder.

I never said however that Samaya was not important. It is. How it is understood differs in different tantras. You can make the same argument for pratimokṣa vows, but in order to have them modified by bodhisattva vows, first you must have received pratimokṣa vows.

Thus far, we have only been dealing pratimokṣa vows. We have not been considering the way in which bodhisattva vows and even samaya vows affect one's basic pratimokṣa vows.

In principle, I think it is too hard to be a Buddhist monk in this day and age. I never said we should abandon the bodhisattva trainings or Vajrayāna contracts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Malcolm, drinking wine is a violation of a basic Buddhist precept. Can one intentionally also break the other four and still able to gain some type of enlightenment in Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Drinking wine is not a violation of five precepts, getting intoxicated is.

As far as the the other four precepts, they must be observed by everyone. Of course, when one becomes sufficiently mature, one ceases to wish to kill, steal, lie or engage in sexual misconduct, and even, become intoxicated.

Vasubandhu's opinion that madana means even a single drop of alcohol is highly debatable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Precepts don't make a renunciate anymore than elaborate rites do.

No, of course not. The desire to take vows should stem from a renunciate's desire to deepen their renunciation.

kirtu said:

There we go!

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, kirt, if you have a problem with drinking then you should take a vow not to drink.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

Right, but that's not defrocking. The perpetrator has the right to move elsewhere. They still have their status as a monk or nun.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is. If you get kicked out of your monastery, you will disrobe. The perpetrator does not have the right to move elsewhere. In order to join a monastery you need sponsorship and references. No one will touch a monk who has been expelled from their monastery in the Tibetan tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There were and are all kinds of mendicants in yellow robes in India, not just Buddhists.

Indrajala said:

Buddhists were specifically targeted in purges and attacks.

Malcolm wrote:

You deliberately missed my point — Brahmins were generally suspicious of shramanas of all denominations, not just Buddhist ones.

Indrajala said:

My position on this has not changed one iota. The fact that there are so called Buddhist "monks" who do not have vows, and generally behave like ordinary people just illustrates my point even more.

There are monks who have vows and behave like ordinary people, too, so your point isn't very strong.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are such monks. But the force of the ordination rite changes the nature of behavior that one is following.

Indrajala said:

Precepts don't make a renunciate anymore than elaborate rites do.

Malcolm wrote:

No, of course not. The desire to take vows should stem from a renunciate's desire to deepen their renunciation.

Indrajala said:

So, were countless millions of bald men and women throughout 20 centuries in East Asia practising the path just laity pretending to be monks? According to you, yes, but according to their own traditions and values, they were renunciates and legitimate monks.

Malcolm wrote:

They were lay Mahāyāna practitioners.

Indrajala said:

Yes, and there is no precept against smoking tobacco, despite the fact that Buddha would have disapproved of it.

According to the Vinaya he allowed disciples to smoke herbs in a pipe if it was so needed as medicine.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as they would have been allowed to drink. But tobacco is a vice, and unlike alcohol, no medical use has been found for it Asian culture anywhere.

Indrajala said:

But this is not how it is for us today. In order to become any kind of ordained person up to bhikṣu, you must become ordained through a rite.

Why? Why can't someone set on liberation and renunciation put on robes and go forward on their own initiative? Why is it that their status has to be legitimized through a rite? Why are you so attached to forms and procedures?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a transmission involved in being ordained. Vinaya ordination requires a preceptor and quorum of monks who have intact vows who are able to transmit those vows; unlike Mahāyāna bodhisattva precepts, which may be undertaken by oneself in absence of a teacher directly from Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. Without that ordination, one cannot be considered a Buddhist monk of any kind. For example, I am sngags pa. Not your average everyday kind of Vajrayāna practitioner that has general samaya. You cannot just invent yourself as a Ngagpa -- though people do -- you must receive a special type of empowerment to be a Ngakpa. Then you may not cut your hair and so on. There are specific reasons for this which are connected with practice.

Likewise with ordination as a novice or a bhikṣu. In the Tibetan tradition, there are many people who remain lifelong shramaneras, often because they regard holding bhikṣu vows too difficult and because it is far less restrictive. But there are specific reasons connected with the bhikṣu vows, and since they are an intact body of vows in each tradition, they are received and transmitted in blocks necessarily. None of the them may be dispensed with. If someone cannot follow a given rule, then it must be confessed, acknowledged etc. This is your peer pressure. Without the support of posadha

recitation, Buddhist monasticism swiftly degenerates.

Indrajala said:

I went through a rite, but to be honest I feel such things are unnecessary.

Malcolm wrote:

Proof we live in a degenerate era.

Indrajala said:

Ordination in any case is a social construct. Renunciation is something else.

Malcolm wrote:

Ordination is not merely a social construct — it is a tradition that comes from awakened people.

Indrajala said:

Ananda, as we know, forgot to ask what "minor" meant and no one so far as had the arrogance to decide what that meant.

No, the various Vinaya schools of India define what they think "minor" meant.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he forgot to ask, and no one felt they knew which minor vows the Buddha meant.

Indrajala said:

In Japan nobody invented new rules permitting marriage.

Malcolm wrote:

I had "invented" in brackets. I know they just ignored their ordination rules.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

I think one practical consideration overlooked in this discussion is that monasticism is economically efficient. ...

Malcolm wrote:

It can't be economically efficient.

Monastics, in Buddhadharma, by definition are dependent on others for everything....Having homeless mendicants creates a financial burden that most

western communities are not interested in supporting and in reality, cannot support. ...Support of the monastic community in Buddhadharma arises from the belief that one will accumulated merit by supporting monastics. There are simply not enough western Buddhists to effectively do so in the West.

kirtu said:

Sure they can be supported. Westerners are impoverished mostly because they don't work together and help one another. In the West it would be easy to create supportable communities specifically for monastics. 3M Western Buddhists could easily support several hundred monastics, perhaps more. As land and buildings accreted, housing becomes much less of an issue and food and other costs drop to near insignificance. In real countries with a real society (i.e. universal health care) this concern isn't an issue (depending on how the universal health care is implemented). Thus the 10-20k Buddhists in Austria may be able to support several hundred monastics on their own (should they emerge).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Leaving aside your long-standing antipathy towards the nation in which you reside (which apparently isn't a real country), I think you missed the point: "...that most western communities are not interested in supporting and in reality, cannot support..." because: "Support of the monastic community in Buddhadharma arises from the belief that one will accumulated merit by supporting monastics..." and there simply are not enough western Buddhists that believe supporting western monastics is sufficiently important since they are already supporting Lamas and Dharma centers, etc.

While I applaud your idealism, the reality is harsh. There simply is not enough support for Western monastics, and the large scale experiments thus far, FPMT, etc., have been marked by spectacular failure for the most part.

I really think that monasticism of virtually every kind is a fading institution because most people do not see it as relevant -- part of this has to do with the dominant Protestant-based culture of the US and northern Europe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm enjoying this conversation as it pertains to the viability of traditional monastic culture and institutions globally. I'd like to shift the emphasis a bit back to the immediate question of desire. Let's say, hypothetically, that a student of Dharma is experiencing very strong desire or attachment or undiluted sexual desire. How ought that student to be advised in terms of practice? What are some different ways in which

a serious student of Dharma might work with desire in practical terms?

Malcolm wrote:

If they are not a Vajrayāna practitioner, they should follow the advice given in the Bodhicaryāvatara concerning attachment and sexual desire.

If they are a Vajrayāna practitioner, they should work with their sadhana practice and understand that Vajrayāna practice tends to heighten afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

JKhedrup said:

...But I don't see enough reasonably sane Westerners taking it up and keeping their ordination for significant periods of time.

Due to the sad reality of the situation, my first question to would-be Western ordinands has to be "how will you support yourself?". And if the answer is by working a regular job in a non-dharma environment, I advise them it isn't a good idea to ordain.

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you. That is my basic point.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have met four people who I am certain are/were genuinely realized people on the bhumis

5heaps said:

how do you tell that it is not merely something like coarse selflessness ie. that persons are btags-yod rather than substantially knowable as they appear now

Malcolm wrote:

Can you rephrase the question in English?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Sometimes it is more pragmatic for Centres to have monastics in certain roles, we are not always necessarily a burden!

For example, because I am a monk translator, I live in the centre and only have to take a small stipend. I know centres where the translators are laypeople and they have husbands/wives and children to support- so they need a bigger salary. If they live outside they need money for rent, if they live in the centre their partner needs a room too.

Even single translators in most cases need a bit of money to go on a date once in awhile, or buy some decent clothes.

Because I'm a monk I can live on a pittance, I am waaay cheaper than a layperson translator would be.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but supporting a community of bhikṣus becomes quickly problematical, don't you agree?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Astus said:

Do you mean that they teach one thing but practise another?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Astus -- this is the function of the two truths.

In truth, this statement by Nāgārjuna illustrates how to practice according to Mahāyāna:

Hold your mind tightly when it (starts to) rove, as though it were
Like your learning, similar to your child, resembling a treasure,
or comparable to your life.

Recoil from the pleasures of sensory objects, as though they were like
Venom, poison, a weapon, an enemy, or fire.

Sensory objects bring ruination! The Lord of the Triumphant
Has said that they're like the kimpaka fruit -
(sweet on the outside, bitter within).

Abandon them! By their iron chains,
Worldly people are bound in the prison of recurring samsara.
Of those who triumph over the objects
Of the ever-inconstant, roving six senses,
And those over a host of foes in battle,
The wise favor the first to be the best heroes.

<http://www.rigdzindharma.org/uploads/6/9/5/6/6956478/nagarjunalettertoafriend.pdf>

Astus said:

You change the view from attachment to objects to non-attachment to objects. This is no different from what Ajahn Chah said, or what you find in Mahayana...

Malcolm wrote:

But in former, you do so without ever giving up such objects, and in the latter, one must give up objects. This is the essential difference between the path of renunciation and the path of transformation.

Astus said:

It means that affliction (klesa) is empty, therefore there is nothing to reject or transform.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in ultimate truth -- but ultimate truth is not a practice, it is a realization. So when you realize emptiness completely, then for you afflictions are singed and no longer give forth fruit. Teachings like these are very characteristic of Chan, which I recognize and accept as a definitive understanding of the purport of Mahāyāna sutras. But Chan is still a path of renunciation, even if its view is beyond accepting and rejecting objects, there is still subtle and not so subtle accepting and rejecting concerning relative and ultimate truth.

Astus said:

...No, only the attachment to them, otherwise arhats would be blind and deaf. The sensation stays, only grasping goes.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is why it is not part of the path of transformation because "...those evil, unskillful thoughts are abandoned and subside." And it is not teaching a path of self-liberation either because the refrain in each verse is "...those evil, unskillful thoughts are abandoned and subside."

But it is a nice sutta and it does present the path of renunciation most perfectly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, most monastics are religious professional providing ecclesiastical services, which is not what Buddha intended for bhikṣus, etc. There were already brahmins for that.

Indrajala said:

History decided otherwise, especially when the traditional mendicant lifestyle became infeasible in some territories. You have Brahmanical literature which talks about what a bad omen it is when yellow robed monks show up. The long conflict between Buddhists and Brahmins, which the former lost, saw a need for landed monasticism.

Malcolm wrote:

There were and are all kinds of mendicants in yellow robes in India, not just Buddhists.

Indrajala said:

...

Later on full bhikṣu ordinations were restricted by the state. Until fairly recently there were not so many full bhikṣu-s in Chinese Buddhism. Modern authors sometimes lamented how earlier a lot of monks just had the tonsure and that's it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, my point precisely.

Indrajala said:

In the case of Zen, a Zen monk in Kamakura Japan was a monk. He lived in a monastery, shaved his head and was expected to maintain celibacy. That's what we call a monk in English. They weren't legally defined as bhikṣu-s, but then in Japanese "bhikṣu" became a humble first person pronoun. Their own forms of monasticism developed based on environmental and social circumstances.

Malcolm wrote:

As you know from the E-sangha debacle, for me a Buddhist "monk" is a bhikṣu. So called Buddhist "monks" who are not bhikṣus, etc., are just celibate/non-celibate lay people.

My position on this has not changed one iota. The fact that there are so called Buddhist "monks" who do not have vows, and generally behave like ordinary people just illustrates my point even more.

Indrajala said:

The fact that money carries value is sufficient. There is no intrinsic value to gold, its value is also determined by fiat.

There ain't no precepts against having fiat currency through a plastic card connected to a global banking network.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and there is no precept against smoking tobacco, despite the fact that Buddha would have disapproved of it.

Indrajala said:

Christian monks, yes, not Buddhist monks.

You should visit Taiwan. They got full bhikṣu-s growing food.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, then they are breaking their precepts, and that is a pity.

Indrajala said:

The Vinaya[s] is/are the only basis upon which someone can be considered a bhikṣu or not.

Bhikṣu just means beggar. There's a legal definition of the term, but you fail to recognize that the Buddha's first disciples and some other eminent followers were technically bhikṣu-s without having received any precepts at all (this is called a svagata bhikṣu in Vinaya jargon). The first disciples had no precepts because precepts only came to exist, at least as the story goes, because of incidents occurring that caused problems for the community.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is true. But when you ordain you receive all of these accreted vows, and are expected to maintain them. For example, when you receive Bodhisattva vows, you don't decide which ones you are going to follow based on whether it is convenient for you. You try your best to follow all.

The first disciples of the Buddha were generally stream entrants very quickly. Later as more common foolish people ordained, Buddha needed to elaborate rules for their conduct. Buddha also was able to merely declare someone a Bhikṣu, without any other rite. But this is not how it is for us today. In order to become any kind of ordained person up to bhikṣu, you must become ordained through a rite. Or are you suggesting we can just dispense with ordination rites as well, since after all, Buddha did not use them in the beginning?

Indrajala said:

The Vinaya system nevertheless is a later development and the fundamentalist interpretation of it, which you are pushing here to justify your lack of generosity towards monastics, was not the Buddha's intent at all. Even according to the orthodox story, he told Ananda to drop the minor rules. He's also on record stating that things could be adapted to foreign environments.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, when monks live in cold climates, they can have leather sandals and fur cloaks; when they are sick they can drink alcohol, and so forth. Ananda, as we know, forgot to ask what "minor" meant and no one so far as had the arrogance to decide what that meant.

Indrajala said:

There's nothing wrong with ignoring or simply cutting away rules and regulations...

Malcolm wrote:

Statements like this merely prove that this age is not a suitable age for monasticism. Pretty soon we will see Buddhist "monks" "inventing" rules that allow one to be married, non-celibate, and wealthy (Oh wait, we already have that in Japan).

Indrajala said:

...which make no sense anymore (like having to smear your room with cow dung after having eaten garlic).

Malcolm wrote:

Cow dung mixed with cow urine and spread on the wall of a clay house smells quite sweet. But granted, it would be hard to do anywhere in the West. But the intent is obvious-- if you eat garlic you need to deodorize yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 8th, 2013 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

I'm somewhat surprised to hear this as there are several Western people who have ordained in the Sakya lineage. I think that some of these Westerners sell others a bit short and quote HE Dezhung Rinpoche's somewhat pessimistic remarks from ~26 years ago (something that Trungpa for one addressed).

There are a few, but not so many. And we will see how long they last.

I never said that you advocated harming beings. I said that you advocate dropping formally taking precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I never said anything such thing. I said it was pointless to take ordination as a bhikṣu in this day and age. I never said that avoiding the ten non-virtues should be ignored (nor would I), I never suggested that people avoid receiving bodhisattva vows, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Monastics, in Buddhadharma, by definition are dependent on others for everything.

Indrajala said:

That's not how it works in real life though.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, most monastics are religious professionals providing ecclesiastical services, which is not what Buddha intended for bhikṣus, etc. There were already brahmins for that.

Indrajala said:

Monastics are forbidden to dig in the ground, so they cannot feed themselves. They are forbidden to handle money, so they really ought not work. In fact, monasticism, of the Buddhist variety, is pretty unsustainable.

Chan and Zen monasteries are well known for their agriculture. They sustained themselves in times of social upheaval and civil war when economic systems were in chaos.

Malcolm wrote:

Bad example, especially in the case of Zen, where we know that virtually no "monks" fit the criteria of being considered bhikṣus. And in China, this kind of labor was done by novices who have no vow not to dig in the ground, not by senior bhikṣus.

Indrajala said:

Again, the issue with money is largely irrelevant. As we know most monastics nowadays use money, which is fiat currency anyway and has no relation to precious metals or gems.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that money carries value is sufficient. There is no intrinsic value to gold, its value is also determined by fiat.

Indrajala said:

Having homeless mendicants creates a financial burden that most western communities are not interested in supporting and in reality, cannot support. I'm sure I don't have to point out to you that there are monks who grow their own food, cut their own firewood and generate their own income through various crafts.

Malcolm wrote:

Christian monks, yes, not Buddhist monks.

Indrajala said:

Your criticism here is based on prescriptions in the Vinaya, many of which are ignored nowadays.

Malcolm wrote:

The Vinaya[s] is/are the only basis upon which someone can be considered a bhikṣu or not. Their success as a bhikṣu depends largely on how successful they are at a) maintaining all of their vows and b) regularly reciting posadha. I would personally never support a monk who was not 100 percent committed to maintain all of their vows precisely. If they were, then I would support them. But because I have met virtually no monks in my tradition [Mulasarvastivada] who are so committed, I don't support them. And that is largely my point, it is very difficult to follow monastic vows precisely in this day and age. Since they all are Vajrayāna practitioners, it is better for them to be laypeople, in my opinion. It is not whether monks are good or bad, it is about whether Buddhist monasticism can be maintained in a proper way, and I think that conditions for that are vanishing, both because of the qualities of the people seeking ordination and because of the qualities of the epoch -- which are both rather inferior, in my opinion -- though there are rare exceptions like HH Dalai Lama, Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche and so on.

Indrajala said:

And frankly, most dana given by Westerners goes into gold for statues and stupas, not into the support of monastics.

Maybe in Tibetan Buddhism that's the case, but that's not universal.

Malcolm wrote:

I was talking about Buddhadharma in the West. Of course, in Asia, there are large populations of monastics who extract a huge amount of money out of lay people for support.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

I think one practical consideration overlooked in this discussion is that monasticism is

economically efficient. Instead of having several households, you have a community living together with shared resources. The community also will ideally look after its own, so if you become ill, then there's always someone to look after you. On top of that communal living can be emotionally rewarding. Practice is up to the individual, but basic life concerns are readily taken care over through monastic arrangements. Not having children and relationships can free up a lot of time in life to focus on one's interests.

There's practical elements to monasticism that we can't overlook. Now, granted, monasticism is not necessarily renunciation, but it is a step in that direction.

Malcolm wrote:

It can't be economically efficient.

Monastics, in Buddhadharma, by definition are dependent on others for everything. Monastics are forbidden to dig in the ground, so they cannot feed themselves. They are forbidden to handle money, so they really ought not work. In fact, monasticism, of the Buddhist variety, is pretty unsustainable.

In fact, the economic burden imposed by the enormous plethora of monastics in the early period of Śakyamuni's Dharma was one of the reasons Ashoka cracked down and assisted the Vaibhajyavadins in "defrocking" many thousands of monks. Having homeless mendicants creates a financial burden that most western communities are not interested in supporting and in reality, cannot support.

Support of the monastic community in Buddhadharma arises from the belief that one will accumulated merit by supporting monastics. There are simply not enough western Buddhists to effectively do so in the West. And frankly, most dana given by Westerners goes into gold for statues and stupas, not into the support of monastics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine, meat, sexual partners and so on has never been discouraged in my spiritual tradition.

Indrajala said:

Sounds like quite a desirable arrangement.

Malcolm wrote:

It is what it is. Some people don't like sex, meat and wine, other people do. There is a path of liberation for both. I personally think the path of the latter is more rapid than the path of the former, but that is just my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

mandala said:

Saying - oh it's kali yuga.. degenerate times.. becoming ordained is too hard, let's get drunk and pick up some women and call it spiritual practice - is frankly the polluted state of mind the Buddha talked about.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I say that? No.

mandala said:

Ditto for using 'you don't see many arhats around these days' as some kind of curious proof that there aren't highly realised practitioners about... well, of course you don't see them, that's your karma. That would be an indication to me that one needs to grow a pair and get serious about keeping vows and ethical living - not to simply declare it wouldn't work in the society we live in because there are so many desirous objects about.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I say there were no highly realized people around? No, what I said was is that these days one does not encounter many arhats or first stage bodhisattvas practicing classical Mahāyāna. I have met four people who I am certain are/were genuinely realized people on the bhūmis, above and beyond the idea that one should regard one's spiritual friend or guru as a buddha. I have met a few more than I am certain have cultivated at least strong heat on Vajrayāna path of application.

mandala said:

No matter what the path, it all starts with renunciation.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, renunciation is the wish to be free from samsara. Some people assume that begins with giving up sense objects. However, that is a false assumption. There is no need to give up sense objects in order to be free of samsara.

mandala said:

The [ordained] sangha is the measure of dharma in the world...

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it isn't. For example, the Buddha Sikkhī was not ordained and never created a monastic Sangha. It may be the measure of Śākyamuni's monastic dispensation, but it is not the measure of Dharma in the world, though a lot of monastics have a vested interest in keeping people convinced that it is so.

mandala said:

In The Heaps of Jewels Sutra, Buddha said: "If all the beings in the universe were to become bodhisattvas as lay people, and they each offered a butter lamp as vast as a great ocean to a stupa containing the relics of all the [past] Buddhas, this would not equal even a fraction of the merit gained by a single ordained bodhisattva offering one butterlamp to the holy stupa."

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, Mahāyāna is a path of renunciation in which monastic ordination is often valorized. However, I would rather achieve liberation swiftly than accumulate a lot of merit in an external fashion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine, meat, sexual partners and so on has never been discouraged in my spiritual tradition.

gregkavarnos said:

"Your" spiritual tradition or the spiritual tradition that you are currently practicing in? Not meaning to be a pedant or anything, but you just sound a little too Jim Jonesish when you make statements expressed in that manner!

Malcolm wrote:

My spiritual tradition. I started out as a Vajrayāna practitioner in Sakya. The attitude towards these things in Sakya is not different in Dzogchen teachings. For example, one of the key creation stage practices for lay people in Sakya is called "The yoga of passion". Meat and alcohol are considered indispensable for Ganapujas, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Clarence said:

Thank you Malcolm for participating in this thread.

Secondly: you mention in another post that the path of transformation is not about experiencing anger and then transforming it. Would you mind elaborating on what you think it really is then?

Malcolm wrote:

The path of transformation involves transforming our impure vision into a pure vision. The basic theory underlying this is that when everything is perceived as gold, one stops desiring gold. So we are to understand through empowerment and then sadhana, for example, that all of our aggregates are buddhas, all of the elements are female buddhas, our sense organs and sense objects are bodhisattvas and offering goddesses and so on. But it is not a psychological technique of antidotes i.e. I am experiencing anger, but this is really Akṣobhya, for example. The path of transformation means transforming our relationship with the world, sentient beings and our own body (through empowerment and sadhana) from an impure relationship into a pure relationship. The path of transformation involves taking the result as the path -- for Buddhas, sense objects are not toxic, they are not afflictive, they are pure goddesses. When sense objects and consciousnesses are purified through the process of sadhana, the afflictive power of sense objects is lessened, and the links between sensation and craving is weakened and finally severed. For example, we replace our sense of identity with a Buddha identity -- the so called "divine pride" which is the essence of the creation stage, etc. In the course of working with pure vision, it is necessary to engage sense objects in every different way, smells, colors, tastes, sounds, sights, and so on.

Clarence said:

Thirdly: you say a path of renunciation of sense objects is not necessary in these times but does that mean retreat is not necessary either? Wouldn't it be better to do a 3-year Thögal retreat than a 3-year The Big Bang Theory Marathon retreat?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course retreat is important. Yes, it would be better to do a three year retreat on one deity like Hevajra, than a retreat where you do tons of different sadhanas. If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, it would be better to do a three retreat on Dzogchen preliminaries like rushan, etc. on up through tregchö and thögal. But one does not need to do a three year retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

The point apparently alluded to is the explicit inclusion of the Bodhisattva path thus supplying trainees with methods that go beyond simple renunciation. Renunciation is added to somewhat in the progressively higher yanas. Principally the Bodhisattva Path sees the beginning of transformation of the perception of sense objects presaging the flowering of that theme in the Vajrayana ("The Wheel of Sharp Weapons" for example).

Malcolm wrote:

When it comes to the Bodhisattva path, we have six or ten perfections, correct? Not one of the six or ten perfections can be construed as enjoying sense objects and sense pleasures for our own benefit. The basis of the bodhisattva path is not enjoyment of sense objects for our own benefit and never can be.

This [enjoyment of sense objects and sense pleasures] is however the basis of the Vajrayāna path in toto.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

Why is Malcolm wrong wrt renunciation? He doesn't just want people to shy away from the Path of Renunciation, he wants people to abandon entry into the monastic sangha as well. He has claimed in other conversations that people are more or less incapable of holding vows and thus the taking of vows sets people up for the cultivation of demerit instead of merit.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact they more or less are so incapable, which is why the Sakya hierarchs actively discourage people from seeking to ordain. But I don't want people to do anything. If people are all fired up to become monks and nuns (mostly because they are having a fantasy that they will be able to practice more and better) then they are free to do as they please.

kirtu said:

Why is Malcolm wrong? He is wrong because as trainees in the Buddhadharma the very first step is to restrain one's behavior and refrain from performing harmful actions. This protects other beings and yourself as well. It protects yourself by immediately accumulating merit and refraining from committing actions that create negative karma.

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever said I was advocating that people go out and harm sentient beings? Your point is wildly and completely off the mark.

kirtu said:

HH Sakya Trizen has said that once one begins behaving in the right way, they naturally create merit. What is behaving in the right way? Of course this involves abandoning killing, stealing, deception (lying), sexual misconduct and harsh, divisive speech.

Malcolm wrote:

But this has nothing to do with my point, once again.

kirtu said:

Why have these two lamas (and many others) not leapt directly to Malcolm's solution of maintaining transcendent awareness or constantly dwelling in the Bodhi mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are projecting -- I never proposed such a solution. I merely pointed out what

HH Sakya Trizin taught so many years ago when I first took teachings from him: that in this day and age, the path of renunciation was not effective anymore, and practicing Vajrayāna teachings such as Hevajra which did not involve giving up sense objects was more effective in this epoch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine and sexual partners is not a problem if you have a proper method.

Indrajala said:

Therein lay the danger: thinking you're successfully carrying out the method when in reality you're just excusing behaviour you know is discouraged by your religious tradition, or at least a good part of it for many many centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine, meat, sexual partners and so on has never been discouraged in my spiritual tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

While Malcolm is entitled to his opinion, I fear some might assume that enjoyment of wine and women/men is not really problematic and instead think they see it all as bodhi while actively engaging in such sense pleasures in a way that proves detrimental.

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoyment of wine and sexual partners is not a problem if you have a proper method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 7:12 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

kirtu said:

What about the reintroduction of the Gomin path (lifelong lay renunciates). Or even one day vows or serious Nyungne practice? This begins to get a little tricky. Malcolm can't just reject Nyungne practice because it is lower tantra (except that from memory he might also reject lower tantra practice). But for some people these are necessary

practice paths (necessary for the individual).

Malcolm wrote:

I don't reject any practice, not even taking ordination. If someone is dead set on becoming ordained, that is their business. I simply think that conditions are not conducive in this age for paths of renunciation, and that other paths are more effective for people.

kirtu said:

The very nature of renunciation changes somewhat from yana to yana but renunciation is still a component even of higher tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

There is renunciation, the wish to be free from samsara. That is one thing. Then there are paths of renunciation, where for example, you follow many rules about what and who you can touch, and what and who you cannot touch and so on, what you should wear, what you should wear.

The former [renunciation] is necessary in every path, and especially it is necessary in the Kali Yuga. The latter [a path of renunciation of sense objects] is not necessary at all, and is especially difficult to follow in the Kali Yuga — and not, in my opinion, a particularly effective path in modern society.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 6:49 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

wisdom said:

In essence the Mahayana approach goes beyond accepting and rejecting objects of the senses as inherently good or bad...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, it doesn't — Mahāyāna regards sense objects as negative, something to be rejected.

Astus said:

This is from a Theravada teacher (who was also a Vinaya specialist),

"For the really earnest student, the more sensations the better. But many meditators shrink away from sensations, they don't want to deal with them. This is like the naughty schoolboy who won't go to school, won't listen to the teacher. These sensations are teaching us. When we know sensations then we are practicing Dhamma."

(<http://www.accesstoinight.org/lib/thai/chah/living.html>)

Malcolm wrote:

This is quite different.

Astus said:

The doctrine that "affliction is enlightenment" (煩惱即菩提) is well known in East Asian Mahayana schools like Chan and Tiantai.

Malcolm wrote:

You can find such statements in Mahāyāna sutras, but such statements do not constitute the path of Mahāyāna.

Astus said:

In Vajrayana they say that the sutra path is renunciation, the tantra path is transformation and the dzogchen path is self-liberation (e.g. <http://www.dzogchen.org.au/index.php?page=dzogchen>).

And here is what a Chan master said,

"There are many methods in practicing Buddhism. The Lesser Vehicle practices "eradicating afflictions." The Great Vehicle (Mahayana) "transforms afflictions." In the Ultimate Vehicle "afflictions are bodhi." Each method is centered on the mind. In the end, they all enable sentient beings to attain unsurpassed complete enlightenment." (http://ctzen.org/sunnyvale/enUS/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=219&Itemid=59)

Malcolm wrote:

In Vajrayāna one does not transform afflictions. That is not what "path of transformation" means in Vajrayāna. You don't experience anger, for example, and then try to change it into the mirror-like wisdom.

Further, we have to examine what is meant by "affliction" is bodhi.

Trotting out slogans does not produce understanding. In fact, it can show that one has not understood anything of what the other person is getting at, as in this case.

Astus said:

Although there are different traditions they are aware of the various methods that can be used in order to deal with desire, anger and ignorance. In a single teaching the Buddha gave five different methods to deal with unskillful thoughts, and these techniques could be matched with the above three:
<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.020.than.html>.

Malcolm wrote:

Perfect example of the path of renunciation in toto. I do not see at all how, for example, this relates in anyway to the path of transformation. I can see very clearly where all five paragraphs of that sutra are as applicable in Mahāyāna as they are in the Nikāya Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 6:35 PM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, yes it does, and anyone sufficiently educated in Mahāyāna knows this.

oushi said:

And you think what, if not education, is the cause of so few arhats nowadays?

Malcolm wrote:

Most arhats were highly educated brahmins, but not all.

oushi said:

so you are perfectly aware of Mahayana teachings that go beyond rejection, or acceptance of any dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

From the perspective of ultimate truth; but Mahāyāna practice is not merely confined to the perspective of ultimate truth. The rejection of sense objects is a key component of the Mahāyāna path, and why it is defined, along with the Nikāya schools, as a path of renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

wisdom said:

In essence the Mahayana approach goes beyond accepting and rejecting objects of the senses as inherently good or bad...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, it doesn't — Mahāyāna regards sense objects as negative, something to be rejected.

oushi said:

Well, no, it doesn't. Of course, you can construct such a view out of all the available teachings, but you can also construct totally opposite view out of them...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, yes it does, and anyone sufficiently educated in Mahāyāna knows this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

wisdom said:

In essence the Mahayana approach goes beyond accepting and rejecting objects of the senses as inherently good or bad...

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, it doesn't — Mahāyāna regards sense objects as negative, something to be rejected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

spot dawa said:

Nirvana itself arises due to conditions...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it doesn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

spot dawa said:

Certainly true, Malcolm! There is a certain very powerful feeling of joy that comes with surrender. A person who has pledged to be of benefit to all sentient beings is drawn on to holiness by that joy, and the pleasures of compassion and lovingkindness. Those feelings of enjoyment are also capable of becoming fetters; they are to be replaced by equanimity.

Also in the same vein as desire, is aversion, as is indifference. Equanimity is the result of applying the antidote to these poisons.

Karma Dorje said:

Applying antidotes is just housekeeping in a dream.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Please try to avoid the sweeping generalisations.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? You don't.

Look around, it is not like there are thousands of arhats, or first stage bodhisattvas. We are not in India in the Pre-Gupta phase, when realization was relatively easy.

We are at the stale end of the dispensation of Śākyamuni. Hell, most [Mahāyāna] people here don't even believe the texts they follow were actually authored by the historical Buddha.

95% of all the westerners that really try to do the Bhikṣu thing give back their vows. It is a little different with bhikṣunis, because they are more ideologically motivated [which is also not exactly renunciation].

As a great Sakya master put it "What's the use of the cutting the hair on your head if you can't cut the woolly mess of concepts?"

I know a lot of bhikṣus -- and every last one of them is worldly and lacks renunciation. Not one of them lives according to Vinaya. It is different in Theravada, of course. But that is ethnic Buddhism, as far as the bhikku Sangha goes -- and even then, renunciation is in short supply in Theravadin monasteries as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

spot dawa said:

who does not cultivate lustful thought or actions...

Malcolm wrote:

Desire objects are not confined to sex. Bodhisattvas in Mahāyāna training are not supposed to enjoy any sense objects for their own benefit, only if it will benefit others. The general attitude in Mahāyāna towards sense objects is illustrated by Candragomin: Objects and poisons are alike, pleasing just when first tasted. Objects and poisons are alike, their result is unpleasant and unbearable.

Objects and poisons are alike, causing one to be clouded by the darkness of ignorance.
Objects and poisons are alike, their power is hard to reverse, and deceptive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

smcj said:

I hear there is a lot of tension in Dharamsala between the Tibetans who come from Tibet and the ones already living there or born there. Apparently the Tibetan Tibetans are disappointed because their standard of living diminishes when they arrive in India (this applies to Lhasa Tibetans).

They are free to go back. They don't.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, they often do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

This is a fault to consider and good cause for abandoning desire.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you are practicing a path of renunciation. But in the Kali Yoga, this is not realistic.

Indrajala said:

Prove it.

Malcolm wrote:

Prove what, that this is not a good time for paths of renunciation?

With logic and reason or text? Or both.

As for the first, [though you simply won't agree even when presented with a vast amount of evidence] in this day and age, the Sangha of Bhikṣus has basically come to the point where it is basically badge wearing and politics, and is completely irrelevant in the world we live in, outside of offering pastoral service to ethnic Buddhists (in ever declining numbers).

And of course there are numerous tantras that declare the path of renunciation of desire objects is no longer effective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 7th, 2013 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Dealing With Desire

Content:

Indrajala said:

This is a fault to consider and good cause for abandoning desire.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you are practicing a path of renunciation. But in the Kali Yoga, this is not realistic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetans did not have the industrial infrastructure to build such a military, nor the economic wealth to buy such a military. So your point is invalid.

Indrajala said:

Was there an attempt to do so? That's the key question.

Japan got the ball rolling on it early on.

Malcolm wrote:

Japan had ports and a healthy trade relationship with the Western colonial powers. They were able to afford a modern Navy, and they were not corrupt like the Qing.

Indrajala said:

The policy of Xenophobia was an understandable response to the encroachment of colonial powers in Asia.

That's just an excuse for a poor political policy.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not an excuse, it is a fact.

Indrajala said:

Look at Japan -- they had an isolationist policy for centuries, but they also were not a landlocked nation.

Right, but when they realized that policy wasn't going to work any longer, they opened up trade and diplomatic negotiations with foreign powers and established themselves as a recognized sovereign state.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, they were forced to open their doors by the United States. No one wanted anything from Tibet because no one understood that there was anything there. People were only interested in Tibet because of border issues.

Indrajala said:

Religious prejudice on the part of the Gelug-controlled Government of Tibet ; all these prophecies came from the Nyingma school, specifically the treasure tradition. Again, not reacting in an intelligent way to a dangerous situation while prophecies all talk about Tibet's imminent downfall.

Malcolm wrote:

All this proves is that Tibetans were keenly aware of their predicament and shows that at least outside of the moribund, Chinese influenced government of Tibet, there was considerable anxiety about what the Chinese would do for over a 100 years. You can understand that Tibet was much like Italy prior to Garibaldi. There was no "Tibet" -- that is why most of your arguments are bogus. The Tibetans even today are not united around questions of ethnicity and tribe. Tibet is a Western political construction for western Colonial purposes.

Indrajala said:

All you are giving evidence of is that your study of Tibetan culture, history and religion lack depth and nuance.

Well, an eyewitness account by Heinrich Harrer states that in the 40s Kham was in fact bandit territory that the Lhasa government had no control over. Nobody had control over it. At the time it seems it was anarchy, at least in the areas he visited and according to the people he spoke to.

Malcolm wrote:

Harrer? Are you serious? The Gelugpas hated Kham because it was a Nyingma stronghold. So of course they would claim it was full of bandits. In fact Khams was most intellectually developed region of Tibet, far more open and interesting than the intellectual moribund monastic cities in Lhasa.

And it was not anarchical in the slightest. For Christ sakes, why dont you read books by people who grew up there and wrote in Tibetan about their experience their. Basing yourself on the reports of Nazis is ridiculous.

Look, the whole story can be traced in this way: in 1705 Lhazang Khan, at the encouragement of Kangxi Emperor, attacked Lhasa and murdered virtually every one in the Govt and took teh 6th Dalai Lama captive. After the sixth was murdered, a seventh Dalai Lama was recognized, and with this one, the Qing Dynasty seized control of Lhasa as well as Kham and Amdo after Tashi Rabten and Zhungar Mongols were defeated (who

themselves had wrested control of Lhasa from Lazang Khan in 1717).

The Kangxi Emperor (1622–1723) declared Tibet a protectorate of the Qing Empire and in 1727 installed two high commissioners, or ambans, and a garrison of Qing troops from China in Lhasa.[10] The walls of Lhasa were torn down and "Kham (with Batang, Litang, Tatsienlu, etc.) annexed to the Chinese province of Sichuan. The Qing protectorate, which was to last till the end of the Qing Dynasty (1912), was established." [11]
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kelzang_Gyatso,_7th_Dalai_Lama

So you see, Tibet was been an occupied nation most of the last two hundred and eighty six years, except from the period of thirty three years i.e., 1913-1950, when conditions made it possible for the Tibetans to throw off Chinese rule and declare independence. But as you can see, even though they did, while the British (to their advantage) accepted that Tibet was an independent nation, the US never did.

[
Indrajala said:
quote]

It is difficult when the Chinese and British are writing treaties about you without your participation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is difficult to participate in diplomatic negotiations when you fail to play the game of formal diplomacy.[/quote]

You might as well blame American Indians for being screwed over by the US Government because they too were either not invited or did not understand the rules. Hell, while we are at it, lets just wash away the Holocaust too, because the Jews were not able to negotiate well with the Nazis. After all, Africans just let themselves be sold into slavery. There is no injustice in the world, just incompetent peoples and nations that allow themselves to be exploited and massacred.

Indrajala said:

You forget that eighty thousand khampas showed up to fight the PLA in 1959. You forget that the invasion of Tibet took nine years to complete, starting in 1950 when the PLA started "liberating" Tibet. You forget that the international community just stood by and watched as the PLA invaded Tibet.

The insurgency of course happened, but how well coordinated was it? The invasion took time, sure, but that's the roof of the world. The failure of the international community to respond is an intriguing question because the western power bloc reacted differently in Korea and elsewhere. It seems to me this was largely because foreign powers just didn't know about Tibet. How many Tibetan representatives at the time could have met with officials in London or Washington?

Malcolm wrote:

No one would supply the Tibetan insurgency with arms until after 1959. Then, the CIA did for a number of years until Nixon abandoned them.

The United States, as a matter of official policy has always considered Tibet a part of China, and therefore, no one would ever hear an embassy from Tibetans advocating for themselves. In 1943 the US State Department wrote:

"The United States considers the Tibet Autonomous Region or TAR (hereinafter referred to as "Tibet") as part of the People's Republic of China. This longstanding policy is consistent with the view of the entire international community, including all China's neighbors: no country recognizes Tibet as a sovereign state. Moreover, U.S. acceptance of China's claim of sovereignty over Tibet predates the establishment of the People's Republic of China. In 1942, we told the Nationalist Chinese government then headquartered in Chongqing (Chungking) that we had "at no time raised (a) question" over Chinese claims to Tibet." [55]

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_relations_of_Tibet#cite_ref-58

Therefore, at no time would the US even have considered helping the Tibetans against the Chinese in an overt war.

Indrajala said:

In fact, it was the 13th Dalai Lama who threw off the shackles of the Qing (which is why he is considered a hero) and tried to modernize the army and so on without success. He might have tried, but his government appears to have acted unwisely resulting in the downfall of Tibet. Nevertheless, at the same time you had all these prophecies predicting the downfall of the culture. Did it seem inevitable?

Malcolm wrote:

The 13th died in 1936. He tried his best having inherited a moribund government that had been eviscerated for one hundred and eighty six years the corrupt politicians of the Qing protectorate.

But when you understand the history a bit better, blaming the Tibetans for losing Tibet is just like blaming a girl for being raped.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Indrajala:

Elsewhere we've discussed varying religious explanations for the cultural destruction of Tibet. In this regard, I brought up the point that I seldom hear anyone, especially Tibetan Buddhists, point out it was the bad political decisions of the Tibetan government that failed to deter the PRC takeover of Tibet.

No, it was the fact that Tibetan Government had been subject the whims of the Qing Dynasty Ambans for most of the nineteenth century that lead to Tibet's weakened political structure in the nineteenth, plus the fact that Tibetan was used as a football

during the great game between Britain and Russia. Also, if you recall correctly, the Tibetans had to repel a Chinese invasion as well as deal with the Younghusband expedition.

Unknown said:

I imagine this has something to do with the issue that if you criticize the former government, you're indirectly criticizing the 13th Dalai Lama Thubten Gyatso, which may be perceived as criticism against the present 14th Dalai Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't think Tibetans are so naive.

Unknown said:

In any case, while the pro-Tibetan lobby frequently lays full blame on homicidal communist forces from China, there were a few factors that made the takeover of Tibet relatively easy.

- Tibet was very reluctant and slow to modernize both its infrastructure and military, thus posing little challenge to the battle hardened mechanized army of the PRC. There was almost no military deterrent.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetans did not have the industrial infrastructure to build such a military, nor the economic wealth to buy such a military. So your point is invalid.

Unknown said:

- The Tibetan government kept foreigners out and didn't make an active move for international recognition until it was too late. They didn't establish embassies in the capitals of world powers. After WWII when it was clear the British were moving out of India, it would have been apparent that Tibet should have entered onto the world stage.

Malcolm wrote:

The policy of Xenophobia was an understandable response to the encroachment of colonial powers in Asia. Tibet's regions at that time border both China and Burma directly, as well as Nepal, etc. and a great deal of trade contact made the Tibetans aware of what was in store for nations like China (and themselves) as well when colonial powers were let in. Look at Japan -- they had an isolationist policy for centuries, but they also were not a landlocked nation.

Unknown said:

- Despite several famous prophecies about the imminent downfall of Tibet, it seems the government didn't do much in the way of serious defensive works to deter foreign aggression.

Malcolm wrote:

Religious prejudice on the part of the Gelug-controlled Government of Tibet ; all these prophecies came from the Nyingma school, specifically the treasure tradition.

Unknown said:

- Lhasa didn't really have control over places like Kham. It was bandit territory that even the government avoided.

Malcolm wrote:

A large part of Kham was controlled by the King of Derge, and during the 19th Century, Derge was the center of the religious and cultural renaissance called "The Ris med" movement. Western Kham was controlled by the King of Nangchen. Chamdo was controlled by Lhasa. You should get your facts straight. All you are giving evidence of is that your study of Tibetan culture, history and religion lack depth and nuance.

Yes, there were bandits in Tibet. There are still bandits in Tibet [in Golog]. There are also bandits in Tokyo.

Unknown said:

Arguably in such anarchy and ill-managed areas a foreign invading force could have just rolled right in, deep into Tibetan territory, as did happen. The Tibetan government didn't do much to secure their borders or even consolidate themselves as a proper nation state which in turn made it easy for the PRC to claim sovereignty over Tibet without much protest from the international community.

Malcolm wrote:

It is difficult when the Chinese and British are writing treaties about you without your participation.

"Early British efforts to create a boundary for north-east India were triggered by their discovery in the mid-19th century that Tawang, an important trading town, was Tibetan territory.[5] Britain had concluded treaties with Qing China concerning Tibet's boundaries with Burma[6] and Sikkim.[7] However, Tibet refused to recognise the boundaries drawn by these treaties[citation needed]. British forces led by Sir Francis Younghusband entered Tibet in 1904 and made a treaty with the Tibetans.[8] In 1907, Britain and Russia acknowledged Chinese "suzerainty" over Tibet.[9]"

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simla_Accord_%281914%29

Unknown said:

Now, granted, what's past is past, but nevertheless the narrative of Tibet's downfall, which is an intrinsic part of Tibetan Buddhism nowadays, is quite slanted and one-sided.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, it is not slanted and one-sided at all.

And the fact is that the fall of Tibet had far more to do with Colonialism in Asia than it has anything to do with some innate failure on the part of Tibetans to defend their own nation. You forget that eighty thousand khampas showed up to fight the PLA in 1959. You forget that the invasion of Tibet took nine years to complete, starting in 1950 when the PLA started "liberating" Tibet. You forget that the international community just

stood by and watched as the PLA invaded Tibet.

Unknown said:

Good Tibetans versus Evil Communist Chinese. That's perhaps easier to digest than the reality where China could opportunistically seize Tibet owing in part to the bad political decisions of the Lhasa government. Understandably, there's going to be a reluctance to acknowledge that point. Still, the pro-Tibetan propaganda line doesn't really help matters much because it is skewed and heavily biased.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, Tibet was a victim of several factors: western colonial policy, specifically, Britain's presence in India. Tibet was also subject to Qing dynasty in the 18th and 19th century, who poisoned several Dalai Lamas to maintain control over Lhasa (there was a lot of money in the Tibetan salt and tea trades). The Qing deliberately kept the Lhasa government weak and under their control. The primary reason that Kham and Amdo were not under the Lhasa Gvt., is that they were territories of China from the early 18th century onward, not because Khams was filled with bandits.

In fact, it was the 13th Dalai Lama who threw off the shackles of the Qing (which is why he is considered a hero) and tried to modernize the army and so on without success.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

yegyal said:

Yes, I have for many years, but I guess you're still going to tell me that they call old monks 'rinpoche.' Well, Indians refer to five year old monks as 'lama' but it doesn't make them lamas.

Indrajala said:

Titles are used loosely and thrown around quite easily. Addressing an elderly Tibetan monk as rinpoche is harmless and done with deferential respect.

Malcolm wrote:

It is harmless, but they think you are an idiot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

Naturally this isn't just TB. I have similar questions about other forms of Buddhism as well. They have grand claims about rapid buddhahood and so forth, but the organizations pushing these claims don't exactly have clean histories. Anyone asking for a demonstration or proof can be told, as I was above, to take it on faith:

All I can say then is that you have not met any mahāsiddhas. Or if you have, you were like Sunakṣatra and could not perceive their qualities.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not an organization, I don't speak for an organization, and you don't have to take anything on faith.

Sunakṣatra was unable to perceive the Buddha's qualities, even though he was his attendant for 24 years. But his vision was blind to Buddha's qualities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

This helps to explain why a lot of Buddhists are flaming egotists, like me.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm...actually, triumphalism is what feeds egos, which is precisely what you are arguing, that Tibetan Buddhists are on a big ego trip.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It has a Vinaya lineage, it doesn't need more than one. Dharmagupta Vinaya is not different than Mulasarvastivada in its intention. The path of Vinaya in all "eighteen" schools is the same path. There are not different Vinaya paths.

Indrajala said:

No all Vinaya paths are identical. The Mahāsāṃghika school had 218 precepts in contrast to the Dharmagupta's 250. Their goals might have been the same, but nevertheless their procedures still differ.

Malcolm wrote:

The paths are identical.

There are different numbers of rules for each Vinaya because all were compiled separately in different places by different groups. There are minor differences in the

mode of ordination procedure. But the paths are the same, how one is to practice, etc. So really, your point isn't valid.

Indrajala said:

My point really is that functionally speaking East Asia just as well has a complete path to liberation plus some components which the Tibetans simply lacked, and there's no reason to denigrate it.

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetans do not lack Vinaya. One does not need more than one Vinaya to be a Bhikṣu.

Indrajala said:

Tibetan Buddhism as two bodhisattva vow lineages...so are you going to now argue that Chinese Buddhism has a less complete Mahāyāna system since it only has one bodhisattva precept lineage?

No, because Chinese Buddhism has two mainstream bodhisattva lineages for precepts. One based on the Brahma Net Sūtra and the other on the Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra / Sūtra of Bodhisattva Stages.

Malcolm wrote:

Brahma net sutra does not come from India. Your argument was predicated on lineages from India.

Indrajala said:

and presumably some of the divination and astrology practices as found in East Asia that originate from India.

These things are not paths. And Pramaṇā as well as other things never found much footing in the Sino-sphere.

Your statement here is problematic.

They are arguably part of some paths. Kukai and Shingon were quite appreciative of the astrology texts as translated by Amoghavajra and others. However, even long before this we find sūtras which offer detailed guidance on astrology. Astrology was a key part of Buddhadharma to some early Buddhists in India.

Malcolm wrote:

The calculation of auspicious days and calendar creation does not constitute a path. Astrology was a key part of agricultural life everywhere in the world at that time -- still is not a path, however.

Indrajala said:

For example, the Mātāṅga Sūtra (摩登伽經), translated into Chinese in 230 CE by Zhiqian 支謙, is the oldest known Indic sūtra translated into Chinese to include jyotiṣa elements such as the 28 nakṣatras, 9 grahas, monthly gnomonic and the Metonic cycle. There was an earlier translation of the text done by An shigao 安世高 between 148-170 CE, though it is much shorter and does not contain astrological references. It is a brief sūtra about a daughter of a witch wanting marry the handsome Ānanda. The mother attempts to use witchcraft to trap and make him consummate a marriage, but fails. The girl becomes a bhikṣuṇī in the end and renounces her evil ways. Zhiqian's work picks up from here and extends the sūtra to include dialogue between characters from some long past time, including many teachings on astrology.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing forbidding the inclusion of astronomical information in sutras and tantras -- that was not my point -- nevertheless astrology and divination do not constitute paths. They simply don't, even if they are useful aids on the path, like medicine, arts and so on.

Indrajala said:

If I'm too thick headed and merit-less to perceive the qualities of a mahāsiddha when I meet them, then there's not much I can do about it at the moment.

Malcolm wrote:

You can be more less intellectual and more open.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

What possible impact on your life, as a Mahayana monk...

Indrajala said:

What exactly does "Mahāyāna monk" mean? Is this in contrast to a Vajrayāna monk? If so, this is again one of those Tibetan Buddhist distinctions that are projected onto others who may not recognize them. That's really unfair, like calling a bhikkhu a Hīnayāna monk. He wouldn't call himself that.

I tend to think of myself more as a śramaṇa. There's really no need to identify with terms so heavily.

Malcolm wrote:

A Mahāyāna monk (or layperson) is someone who, in addition to Pratimokṣa vows, also has Bodhisattva vows. A Vajrayāna monk (or layperson) additionally has samaya vows. Where the lower vows contradict the higher vows, one follows the higher vows.

A bhikku would not recognize Theravada (along with the other "eighteen" schools) as hīnayāna, and he also would not recognize the validity Bodhisattva vows or Vajrayāna vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 6th, 2013 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that virtually all late Indian Vajrayāna tantras and transmissions, as well as late Mahayāna developments such as the Abhisamaya-alaṃkara tradition, etc., are absent everywhere but in Tibet, Nepal and Mongolia means that no other tradition has all paths taught in India. Thus, the statement can be read as a true statement.

Indrajala said:

"All paths" as late Indian Vajrayāna and Mahayāna excludes other core components which make up a "complete system of Buddhism". Tibetan Buddhism doesn't have a Dharmagupta Vinaya lineage. It has the one Vinaya lineage, sure, but not the alternative paths that were available in India.

Malcolm wrote:

It has a Vinaya lineage, it doesn't need more than one. Dharmagupta Vinaya is not different than Mulasarvastivada in its intention. The path of Vinaya in all "eighteen" schools is the same path. There are not different Vinaya paths.

Indrajala said:

This same applies for bodhisattva precept lineages

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhism as two bodhisattva vow lineages...so are you going to now argue that Chinese Buddhism has a less complete Mahāyāna system since it only has one bodhisattva precept lineage? It seems you must since you fault Tibetan Buddhism for only maintaining one Vinaya lineage. In reality, the intention of bodhisattva precepts are the same whether concise (Nagarjuna's lineage) or elaborate (Asanga and Chinese system).

Indrajala said:

and presumably some of the divination and astrology practices as found in East Asia that originate from India.

Malcolm wrote:

These things are not paths. And Pramaṇā as well as other things never found much footing in the Sino-sphere.

Indrajala said:

Is late period Indian Vajrayāna so much better than what Shingon and Taimitsu in East

Asia acquired and developed? The developments in India are not necessarily going to be superior to what unfolded in, say, Shingon or even other native schools like Chan.

Malcolm wrote:

You really do not want me to answer that question. But yes, frankly, Anuttarayoga tantra is intrinsically more profound than Yogatantra, which, by itself, is already profound. I encourage you to receive abhiśeka and practice and study Vajrayāna. All you have to lose is a few more lifetimes on the path.

Indrajala said:

I often find Tibetan Buddhists like to claim the superiority of their practices in contrast to lesser teachings and practices (not you specifically Malcolm), yet very few demonstrate the qualities which they claim their practices rapidly develop.

Malcolm wrote:

All I can say then is that you have not met any mahāsiddhas. Or if you have, you were like Sunakṣatra and could not perceive their qualities.

Indrajala said:

There's something of a superiority complex tied to a lot of Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot of triumphalism in Buddhism in general, as religions go, it is very triumphalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhism contains the complete path for awakening for every single conceivable layer of the development of Buddhism in Buddhist history, Hīnayāna, Mahāyāna and Mantrayāna (including a few developments, such as Dzogchen that do not at all exist outside of Tibetan Buddhism). That is what is meant by "complete".

Indrajala said:

The issue is that some Tibetan Buddhists claim themselves as the only ones with a truly complete path.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that virtually all late Indian Vajrayāna tantras and transmissions, as well as late Mahāyāna developments such as the Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra tradition, etc., are absent everywhere but in Tibet, Nepal and Mongolia means that no other tradition has all paths taught in India. Thus, the statement can be read as a true statement. It does not mean that other Mahayana traditions do not present a complete path to Buddhahood, it just means that in Tibetan Buddhism one has available all paths that have ever been taught

under the rubric of "Buddhism". That cannot be said of any other tradition. It is a simple fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: bit of confusion - 5 colors

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Vairocana is not just the color blue, Vajrasattva is not just the color white in that sequence, but Vairocana arises with all five colors; blue, white, red, yellow, and green."

-- Vajrasattva's Heart Mirror Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

Indrajala said:

My point is really to demonstrate that some Tibetans, or Tibetan Buddhism in general, defines itself as a caretaker of a complete transmission of Indian Buddhism, despite the fact this is easily contested and moreover refuted. Still, it is part of the Tibetan national identity.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhism contains the complete path for awakening for every single conceivable layer of the development of Buddhism in Buddhist history, Hīnayāna, Mahāyāna and Mantrayāna (including a few developments, such as Dzogchen that do not at all exist outside of Tibetan Buddhism). That is what is meant by "complete".

No one intends by complete that Tibetans translated every Indian text. We know this because the record of eminent translators mention that there were many sutras, tantras, and so on that were not translated in Tibetan, such as the Kalacakra in 500,00 lines; The Hevajra Tantra in 500,00 lines, and so on. So obviously, Tibetans themselves are aware that they did not manage to translate every text. But what they were able to bring to Tibet was a complete path covering all three yānas (as defined from a 8th--10th century Indian Vajrayāna perspective). Yes, of course, we all known including Tibetans, that Tibetan Buddhism was a snapshot of late medieval Indian Buddhist culture during its decline phase.

Further, Merely bringing Abhidharmakosha, Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra and one Tantra say, Kalacakra, would constitute a complete transmission of Indian Buddhism.

Buddhadharma is a path, not a bunch of books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Thanks Malcolm, it is very interesting. It seems at the very least that these 4 categories of Tantra are somewhat fluid in some respects.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for example, Manjushri Namasamghiti can be commented upon as a Yoga tantra text, but also as an Anuttarayoga tantra text, or even as a Dzogchen text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Thanks Malcolm. I have heard Sarvavidya mentioned during teachings on Tantric Grounds and Paths, but have never heard of an initiation being given into it.

It is interesting what you say about the Tara and Medicine Buddha practices- most of the initiations rituals I have translated for Geshe describe the practices as Kriya Tantra. Would this be because they are Jenangs/subsequent permissions rather than dbangs?

I have only translated one 2 day wang/ full initiation into Chenrezig, and it was still described as Kriya Tantra. So now I am totally confused, though I am not dismissing at all what you said, just unsure of what it means on the ground!

Malcolm wrote:

There are many elaborate abhishekas in Kriya tantra.

Medicine Buddha, Tara and so on come from Kriya but they are general practiced according to Yoga Tantra view, that makes them automatically Caryā. There are specifically Caryā level tantras like the Vairocana-abhisambodhi, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 5th, 2013 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Government of Pre-PRC Tibet

Content:

JKhedrup said:

And the Yoga tantras are missing from Tibet, no? How much practice is there of

Performance Tantra?

AFAIK, Yoga Tantra is available in Japan.

Malcolm wrote:

Sarvavidyā [From the Sarvadurgatiparishodana] practiced widely in Kagyu, Sakya and Gelugpa is Yogatantra.

Practices such as Tara, Medicine Buddha and so forth where the wisdom being is dismissed is Caryā Tantra.

What is not practiced much in Tibetan Buddhism is kriya tantra. But all the initiations for Kriya, Caryā and Yoga Tantra still exist and are transmitted in every generation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 6:49 AM

Title: Departure

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dear Friends:

The time has come for me to bid adieu to this particular forum.

You know how to find me via my blog, <http://www.atikosha.org> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;".

I will not be checking back in so there is no point in replying this post.

Malcolm

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Evolving Beyond Tribalism

Content:

MalaBeads said:

[

I don't know how to have this discussion. I see Dharma as a-cultural, or beyond culture. Not confined to any particular system or any particular era. However, as with learning any art, you have to master the particulars. And particulars are always associated with a "system". The system I learned - and so did you Malcom, was Buddhist. ?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't learn Buddhism, in fact what I learned was Dharma. My mistake for many years

was mistaking the former for the latter.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thank you, but with all respect, It is just illogical for me,

Malcolm wrote:

Suit yourself, I myself prefer to follow what Indian Mādhyamikas, who were capable of debating with actual Yogacara masters, have to say about the matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Got it in regards to the "fringe" thing! Thank you!

Still some nagging doubt about the -ism bit. What is it about the practice of tantra (or tantric practice) in Hindu and Buddhist religion that does not make it an -ism?

Malcolm wrote:

Tantrism is more or less a Western academic fabrication.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Why was it not the way all Indian religious or spiritual movements practiced per se (because it seems to have been a "fringe" thing).

Malcolm wrote:

Subsequent to British Colonialism, forms of religion deemed offensive to the British were largely purged by Western Educated Hindus. Hence what we now think of a "fringe" thing was the dominant religious form among Hindus until the 17th century i.e. the so called Shakti traditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So are you saying that the shared (let's say ritual) similarities between Buddhist Tantra and Hindu Tantra (for example) are not an example of a shared methodology: a "Tantrism", or "Tantric" approach, if you wish? (let me add you kicked off the use of the word in this thread, I made no such mention previously).

PS I am not being argumentative, I am trying to understand.

Malcolm wrote:

They share methodologies and similarities because they both come from Indian culture, but not because there was something special about "tantra" itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, October 6th, 2012 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

But wait on, is the discussion about religions or practice? Tantra is, after all, merely a form of method/practice COMMON to some forms of Hinduism and Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a kind of misconception. "Tantra", as a movement is a purely Western historical construction. As I have often pointed out, the earliest texts known as "tantras" are medical texts belonging to Ayurveda.

gregkavarnos said:

I said method not movement. Do you prefer the term praxis?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no real such thing as "Tantrism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Zen to Tibetan Dictionary? *grins*

Content:

pemachophel said:

For a discussion of the Tibetan Chan Malcolm is referring to, Google Sam van Schaik + Tibet. This will get you to his blog on early Tibetan history. He has 3-4 articles on this issue based primarily on texts from the Dunhuang cache. IMO, definitely worth the read.

Malcolm wrote:

Also in another a thread, there is a link to some papers published on sems sde, one of which review Jeffery Broughton's contention that Chan was influential on Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Evolving Beyond Tribalism

Content:

MalaBeads said:

Buddhism teaches us about the root of these faulty perceptions.

Malcolm wrote:

Substitute "Dharma" for "Buddhism" and I will readily agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhst Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

But wait on, is the discussion about religions or practice? Tantra is, after all, merely a form of method/practice COMMON to some forms of Hinduism and Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a kind of misconception. "Tantra", as a movement is a purely Western historical construction. As I have often pointed out, the earliest texts known as "tantras" are medical texts belonging to Ayurveda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in English

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by complete?

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I don't really know. It's just that often when reading Dzogchen discussions I feel like I am missing some basic information, and I was wondering if there was some systematic presentation I could consult.

I think you recently mentioned 4 of Longchenpa's treasures in a similar context, but of those, 2 are not yet translated, and I'm not sure if you think the translations available are really accurate.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in terms of overview, Dudjom Rinpoche's book is fine. But if you are looking for details of how to practice Dzogchen, these days the emphasis is on man ngag sde, and as such, the main text most Lamas teach from is Tri Yeshe Lama. But there are a number of other texts as well.

The Theg mchog mdzod is the most comprehensive review of man ngag sde literature, but it is not translated as of yet, so far as I know.

There is ChNN's Santi Mahasangha, and those who have received all nine levels (no one as of yet to my knowledge) will have received the most comprehensive training in the three series of Dzogchen available.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

Raksha said:

Suffice to say that the Hindus never beat the Buddhists in debate...

pueraeternus said:

Can you recommend any books or articles that studied this? I have always wondered this, but most of what I have read came from the Buddhist POV, so that's probably biased. It would be interesting to see if there are academic research that confirms that for the most part, Buddhist pandits trounce Hindu ones.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no real objective accounts, just sectarian annals on both sides.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Zen to Tibetan Dictionary? *grins*

Content:

Huseng said:

Chan specific terms won't exist in Tibetan.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that just isn't true actually. There are a number of Chan texts in Tibetan translation

dating from the eighth century and before.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

Raksha said:

Suffice to say that the Hindus never beat the Buddhists in debate...

Malcolm wrote:

That is a pretty unfounded statement. Did you forget Shankaracarya? Navy Nyaya?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen in English

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

This might be a stupid question, but it is a sincere one. Is there anything like a complete, accurate presentation of Dzogchen available in English?

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by complete?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Evolving Beyond Tribalism

Content:

viniketa said:

The reason human society is not utopia already is that no one has figured out a way to replace "what is" with "what should be". If done by force, coercion, or even mere fraud, utopia collapses immediately.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, no one has yet discovered a method of universally replacing samsara with nirvana. Hence Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

username said:

major extremist right wingers

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I see. Now I am "major extremist right winger?"

Do you seriously think that my piddling opinions have the weight to destroy centuries of world culture?

Are you so deluded as to think that you are saving the masses (your words in another post) in some grand scheme derived from Plato's Republic where you, "having renounced your religion" (again, your words), a philosopher king (with advanced western academic degrees, yawn) are preserving religious palliatives for the ignorant masses until such time as they can become Buddhists?

You are on such a tear about my insignificant opinions that you have made yourself look ridiculous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Can I Hang Up A Thangka Received as a Gift?

Content:

Mr. G said:

I received a very nice thangka of White Mahakala from a very good friend. He even had it specially framed, and I believe just the framing itself cost a good deal of money (possibly around \$300). My friend doesn't know much about Tibetan Buddhism, and took the thangka solely to be a piece of art. I know I'm not supposed to hang up thangkas in my apartment like it's just a piece of art, but I also would not like to offend my friend. Thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

Hang it up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, October 5th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Seriously, man.....read it again, and the meaning is clear.

Malcolm wrote:

Careful Cone, you have put on a black list as my "friend". Lord knows what our resident Joe McCarthy will do next. Perhaps setup a Commission on Un-Buddhist Activities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 10:43 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Yudron said:

So, as another example, I would love to see a panel discussion with ChNN,

Malcolm wrote:

You have seen enough Nyingma Khenpos, you can read Van Shaik, etc. easily. I suggest you attend a retreat with ChNN instead, as that would be more useful for you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Yudron said:

I often think how wonderful it would be if the idea of a panel discussion could be introduced in Tibetan Buddhism. Just to listen to a civil discussion on how emptiness is presented in the various schools, for example, would be really informative.

Malcolm wrote:

Its pretty straight forward actually: the Sakyas and some Nyingmapas follow the view of Madhyamaka promulgated during the early period. Most Kagyus and some Nyingmapas adhere to the gzhan stong view, first elaborated by Dolbupa. Gelugpas and some Nyingmapas adhere to the presentation of emptiness first elaborated by Je Tsongkhapa.

For the most, the lines of discussion and debates between these three approaches to emptiness have remained unchanged since the 15th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Yudron said:

Many Nyingma lamas just ignore that ChNN exists, and that is their way of dealing with his unconventional approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Yet, many of them have adopted features of his approach...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

heart said:

That must have been quite an interesting discussion, all things considered.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The way CHNN explains it, it was not so interesting for him.

heart said:

Yes, I also heard it several times, he don't sound to amused. But knowing Khenpo Choga a little, well he is not stupid and quite unusual. Did you ever meet him?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, I never met him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

heart said:

That must have been quite an interesting discussion, all things considered.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The way CHNN explains it, it was not so interesting for him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Now I see what it's all about.

A typical a case where a religious fiction clashes head on with historical facts, with all the ruffle such accidents usually cause.

The big red book (Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism: Its Fundamentals and History by Dudjom Rinpoche) is rather well known. I, on the other hand, would be prone to recommend this particular book for those interested in History instead of the hegemonic religious version of it.

Yudron said:

It's not as simple as that--that one version is fact and one is fiction. Neither version of early Dzogchen history fits our western idea of historical fact in any way, shape, or form. I don't mean this disrespectfully, but they are legends, like Noah's Ark and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN's book is not about the history of Dzogchen. Dzogchen is mentioned tangentially in the book because he argues it was present in Bon prior to the arrival of Indian Buddhism to Tibet. The book is about establishing that Tibet already had its own culture, literature, system of writing and so on prior to the time of King Trisrong Detsen. I suggest you read it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, October 4th, 2012 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

. The back story is that on hearing that ChNN was coming to Nepal, Khenpo Choga started boasting to everyone that he was going to debate ChNN and defeat him. We all know how that turned out for him.

heart said:

So Khenpo Choga was one the Khenpos that visited ChNNR while he was at Tulku Urgyen?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 3rd, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Yudron said:

In any event, ChNN's old book *Necklace of Zi* upset a lot of lamas at the time, because it does not reflect the traditional Nyingma view of Tibetan History. This led to Dzongsar Khyentse saying that ChNN had done more to harm the Nyingma lineage than the Chinese ever did, and so on. But that is water under the bridge.

My understanding of the story was that ChNN said that he was commissioned to write the book by the Tibetan Women's Association as a political history of Tibet and it was not meant to be a religious history, and that pacified the situation.

Malcolm wrote:

I have heard this story from ChNN myself, personally, more than once.

The back story is that on hearing that ChNN was coming to Nepal, Khenpo Choga started boasting to everyone that he was going to debate ChNN and defeat him. We all know how that turned out for him.

And yes, in the course of his research, ChNN has found many things that contradict certain features of both Nyingma as well as Bon accounts concerning the imperial era. And yes, this has upset some Tibetans -- many who foolishly continue to assert to this very day that ChNN is a Bonpo.

Yudron said:

How I am supposed to relate to the lineage histories -- be they Nyingma or Bon -- of the origins of Dzogchen, as someone with a pretty good Western education, is a mystery to me. I'm pretty excited about this subject actually... and open minded.

Malcolm wrote:

The origins of Dzogchen are given in the *man ngag sde* tantras, mainly the *sgra thal gyur* and its commentary. The account of the origins of Dzogchen is mythological in scope and involve the twelve teachers prior to Garab Dorje. AFAIK, ChNN takes this account literally, as fact. His twist, if you will, is adding the name of Tonpa Shenrab to that list as a Dzogchen nirmanakāya. This is not without precedent in Nyingma, since as you will recall Guru Chowang also asserts that Tonpa Shenrab is a nirmanakāya who taught the liberative vehicles as well in his *gter 'byung che*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, October 3rd, 2012 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Lama and moving

Content:

freakpower70 said:

From what I have heard it is a violation of the student teacher relationship to take a new teacher before one has finished the former's instructions.

Malcolm wrote:
You heard wrong.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 5:11 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?
Content:

username said:
They claimed to be Dzogchen masters and wanting to purge Dzogchen of Bonpos.

Malcolm wrote:
No.

username said:
They were told to go away once they started debating him by asking him about the view of the basis when he told them to go away.

Malcolm wrote:
No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 5:11 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?
Content:

username said:
We know there are differences of opinion on ngondro, etc. You are wrong on both counts.

underthetree said:
Are there differing opinions on rigpa (or whatever the translation du jour is - maybe I've just answered the question...)?

username said:
We are told rigpa is not a matter of semantic, cognition, concepts etc. but of ineffable experience and realization or knowledge of the ultimate state by the person. There are many opinions by them on how to teach students though.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, as I said, differences on pedagogy -- (but of course since you love to disagree with every fricking thing I say, you even do so when you contradict yourself).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

username said:

There are still TB Dzogchen masters who publicly do not accept Bonpos Dzogchen. I don't accept them. But that is my opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

What is that you do not accept? Bonpo Dzogchen masters?

username said:

We know there are differences of opinion on ngondro, etc. You are wrong on both counts.

Malcolm wrote:

Differences of opinion about pedagogy, not differences in opinion about the meaning of Dzogchen -- but you are such a tear to find fault with what I say, you are completely blind to anything other than whatever fictions you spin in your head.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

catmoon said:

Okay, then they should all be in perfect agreement in their teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen masters are, when it comes to discussing Dzogchen.

catmoon said:

All righty. With that kind of agreeent, it must surely be impossible that there would be sects in Dzogchen, since all the teachers are in perfect agreement. It must be nice to enjoy the sort of universal agreement that no other religion in the history of humanity has attained. This would also explain the complete absence of conflict in the Dzogchen threads here.

Nope, couldn't say it with a straight face.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no sects in Dzogchen per se. There are differences in how this knowledge should be approached, which is what you see being discussed. But there is no room for debate about what Dzogchen is. Of course, most of the people here talking about Dzogchen have little or no facility in Tibetan, and therefore, are quite limited in their scope.

These days, the definitive read on Dzogchen is held to be Longchenpa's four treasures of the dharmadhātu, reality, subjects and supreme vehicle. Dzogchen is a very precise teaching and in this end, even when people disagree about the best method of pedagogy, they do not disagree about meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

username said:

It is wrong to state all Dzogchen masters are united when discussing Dzogchen. ChNN often tells the story of when he was staying with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche in Nepal and three Dozgchen masters, couple of Khenpos and a tulku, suddenly appeared to debate him in the presence of TUR on why ChNN is wrong to accept Bonpos as genuine Dzogchenpas. He disagreed. They asked for elaboration on the view of the base in Dzogchen and a debate on invalidity of Bonpo Dzogchen. ChNN said, you should know about the basis and there will be no explanation. We disagree and there will be no debate from me on Dzogchen or Bonpos with you. They promptly left.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN never said they were Dzogchen masters.

If you are going to tell a story, get the facts straight.

They wanted to question him on the basis of their misunderstanding of a point of history he had explained in one of his books i.e. that Tonpa Shenrab existed before both Shakyamuni and Garab Dorje, and therefore, they concluded he, ChNN was stating that Dzogchen has its origin in Bon. Of course ChNN explained to them to the history of the 12 ancient masters of Dzogchgen beginning with Nangwa Dampa, who are much more ancient than Tonpa Shenrab.

The three, abashed, then requested Dzogchen teachings from ChNN, who replied to the effect he does not teach Dzogchen to people who come to debate with him about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

catmoon said:

Ok, then there should be zero difference between realized masters.

Malcolm wrote:

There is zero difference in the substance of their realization.

catmoon said:

Okay, then they should all be in perfect agreement in their teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen masters are, when it comes to discussing Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, October 2nd, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

catmoon said:

Ok, then there should be zero difference between realized masters.

Malcolm wrote:

There is zero difference in the substance of their realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 1st, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

(Leaving aside Zen, which is actually more widespread than Vajrayāna Dharma), Vajrayāna is more popular because it promotes liberation in a single body and a single lifetime. Second, it is intrinsically more adaptable to our highly technological civilization because it is very much based on a yogic understanding of liberation i.e. how the body is an instrument of liberation, not just the mind alone.

M

Huseng said:

How many Tibetan Buddhists in the west though study it to that extent (the body as an instrument of liberation and all the technical details)?

Malcolm wrote:

I would say most, since empowerment into that knowledge is the defining feature of Vajrayāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, October 1st, 2012 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular?

Content:

Huseng said:

I'm going to go out on a limb here and ask a question I've been pondering for awhile.

Why is Tibetan Buddhism more popular in the western world than, say, Zen, Chan, Tendai, Pure Land, Seon or any other form of contemporary Mahāyāna?

Malcolm wrote:

(Leaving aside Zen, which is actually more widespread than Vajrayāna Dharma), Vajrayāna is more popular because it promotes liberation in a single body and a single lifetime. Second, it is intrinsically more adaptable to our highly technological civilization because it is very much based on a yogic understanding of liberation i.e. how the body is an instrument of liberation, not just the mind alone.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 30th, 2012 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

catmoon said:

There is no Dzogchen, it's just a word. Each person's practice differs radically from the next guy's even if they are chanting from the same book, reciting identical words. That in turn differs radically from the teacher's practice, and his teacher's practice, all the way back.

Malcolm wrote:

You says this because you do not understand Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 29th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

username said:

He said he used the commentaries to clean up the old root's original commentary's photocopy his friend smuggled out of Potala into a definitive mistake-free correct

version since the old copying method gremlins had struck that too. This took him several years. I don't think he had time to clean up 6 commentaries on it or cared to with all his activities and health problems during that time. Though possible he did and said so, but I doubt it and think he just used them as reference to clean up the main commentary. I hope you finish your Rongzom stuff too after all these years. He is undiscovered in the west and just as great if not greater than Longchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

The six commentaries we have are:

a commentary on the sgra thal gyur (edited by ChNN from two different manuscripts, one belonging to the Great Fifth)
a commentary on the mu tig phreng ba
a commentary on the yi ge med pa
a commentary on the sgron ma bar ba
a commentary on the sku gdung 'bar ba
and a commentary on the kun bzang klong drug.

These six commentaries, apart from the Vima Snying thig and the seventeen tantras themselves, are the most important ancient Dzogchen texts we have.

My Rongzom translation needs to editing, along with a whole lot of other stuff I have done. But I am only one person.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Sherlock said:

ChNN remarked that he helped prepare the text for the 6 commentaries in a recent webcast IIRC although he didn't elaborate.

Malcolm wrote:

He edited the sgra thal 'gyur commentary, but I was not aware that he was working on teh others, though it makes sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Yudron said:

Thank you. I do hope that if you start preparing Dzogchen translations for publication, that you will either have a glossary in the back with this kind of explanation

Malcolm wrote:

For key terms my glossaries will contain definitions derived from original and ancient Dzogchen commentaries themselves. My method is to base myself on how these terms are actually defined in Tibetan by the ancient masters as much as possible. While I will not be providing the texts themselves, my translations contain references to the Tibetan page number on every page, so someone with some facility in Tibetan can go and look in the original and see how I have translated something.

M

Yudron said:

That all makes sense for a scholarly minded person, who was reared in the Sakya tradition before coming to Dzogchen.

I'm really happy you will be providing glossaries and page references. Which "ancient masters" do you rely on for definitions? Rangzom?

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever wrote the commentaries on the seventeen tantras, traditionally attributed to Vimalamitra. In particular, the commentary on the sgra thal gyur attributed to him is an excellent source of definitions. There is much in that commentary alone that has been largely abandoned by the later tradition, not to mention the commentaries on the mu tig phreng ba, kun bzang klong drug, and so on, as well as the 119 intimate instruction section of the Vima snying thig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Svasamvedana

Content:

Yudron said:

Malcolm,

The rang syllable is an endless source of confusion for me. The Dzogchen masters themselves seem to gloss it as meaning "of itself" (or "naturally") sometimes, and then sometimes it refers to the one's own person. In general we beginners need to be aware of the genitive particle that is omitted in the contractions used in dzogchen texts (such as rang rig), and that may help us understand the usage?

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, self-aware or self-knowing requires the instrumental particle kyis/gis/gyis/ etc.

For example, "rang gi lus" means simply "one's body" likewise, "rang gi rig pa" means simply "one's knowledge". In the most ancient dzogchen commentaries such as the two volume commentary on the sgra thal gyur, "rang" of rang rig is glossed simply as gnas pa i.e. as a location.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This statement simply ignores and betrays ignorance of the entire history of tenet system literature in India as well as Tibet.

M

Mariusz said:

I've already read english books which I always quoted here. Of course I will be happy if you again present some new quotes in question. Thanx

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you have read books influenced completely by a post-14th century read on Indian Tenet systems.

For example, the eleventh century Nyingam scholar, Rongzom Chozang, writes in his seminal intro to Mahayāna systems:

When the Yogacara assert the characteristic of emptiness of dualistic false conceptualities, emptiness is not asserted to be anything other than the other dependent.

Or:

Also in the system of the Yogacāra, the mind and mental factors of the three realms, the characteristic of the falsely imagined is not an object and also is not a subject, [6/a] but a tenet system of being the characteristic of a mere self-reflexive cognition empty of both [subject and object] is asserted.

And then he includes a paraphrase from Asanga's Mahayānasamgraha to support his assertion.

Or, when summarizing their final view:

When the [Yogacāra] tenets are summarized, all [schools of Yogacāra] claim “Non-conceptual primordial wisdom possessing the suchness of being empty of duality substantially exists as ultimate.

Thus, your claim that Tsongkhapa was the first to marginalize Yogacāra as cittamatra is shown to be unfounded. Also Sakya Pandita demonstrates the same thing as Rongzom.

Or Kawa Paltseg's Ita ba'i rim pa bshad pa, written in the later 8th or early 9th century places Vijñaptimatra [i.e. Yogacāra/Cittamatra] below Madhyamaka:

The vehicle of characteristics has three divisions:

Vijñaptimatra; Yogacara
and Sautrantika Madhyamaka.

The Vijñaptimatrins assert that [the appearance of] a man of [a misperceived] cairn does not exist like bamboo horse,
the deluded appearance of one's own consciousness;
assert that the ultimate is a moment of wisdom;
and are in accord with Yogacāra Mādhyamika [in terms of] the relative.
[But Mādhyamikas] assert the ultimate as non-arisen emptiness,
and the Sautrantika [Mādhyamikas] assert the relative as mere illusion,
seen as appearing from the perspective of the object.
Since it is sublime, freedom from the two extremes
is asserted to be great Madhyamaka.

Now, the difference between Yogacara Madhyamaka, formulated by Shantaraksita and so called Sautrantika Madhyamaka (meaning Buddhapalita, Bhavaveka, etc.) was well known at this time. But Yogacara itself was considered inferior to Madhyamaka, and Yogacara, Vijñaptimatra and Cittamatra were all considered synonyms in Tibet up until the time Dolbupa.

This text, incidentally, gives the first appearance of the term "dbu ma chen po" that we know of.

So it is just wrong to claim that Tsongkhapa was the one who "marginalizes" Yogacara as cittamatra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Yudron said:

Thank you. I do hope that if you start preparing Dzogchen translations for publication, that you will either have a glossary in the back with this kind of explanation

Malcolm wrote:

For key terms my glossaries will contain definitions derived from original and ancient Dzogchen commentaries themselves. My method is to base myself on how these terms are actually defined in Tibetan by the ancient masters as much as possible. While I will not be providing the texts themselves, my translations contain references to the Tibetan page number on every page, so someone with some facility in Tibetan can go and look in the original and see how I have translated something.

Like many practitioners of Dzogchen I study "Kama" and practice terms.

I do not spend much time on later Dzogchen texts because they are all 100 percent

derivative of ancient texts. About as modern as I get is the 14th century in general. Everything in Dzogchen has completely developed by that time. Longchenpa is not really at all original in terms of Dzogchen. He merely represents the culmination of the development of snying thig tradition, some might argue he is the fruit of that tradition.

In terms of actual content, there is nothing original in Dzogchen following the revelation of the Mkha' 'gro snying thig by Tsultrim Dorje in the early 14th century (which is notable mainly for the way it combines anuyoga into Dzogchen, not because it is especially novel in comparison with the Vima snying thig). Everything that follows is just restatement, a defense against polemics or a minor clarification.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Sūtra, Tantra, & Essence Mahāmudrā

Content:

viniketa said:

Having only an elementary familiarity with both Mahāmudrā and Dzogchen, I recently ran across a book on Mahāmudrā and picked it up to learn more about Mahāmudrā: Brown, Daniel, (2006). Pointing Out the Great Way: The Stages of Meditation in the Mahāmudrā Tradition. It seems a good overview of the Mahāmudrā tradition; I like the way in which the author places the tradition in the history of both Indian and Tibetan Buddhism and in the three major methods of practice: sūtra, tantra, & essence.

As I do not read (or speak) Tibetan, as I thought would happen, I am coming across terminology that seems familiar but that, without a Sanskrit or Pali base, I'm uncertain. For example, the gnas lugs, Brown presents as the "Buddha nature" of mind, or "the way the realized mind stays". Now, Buddha-nature I would equate with tathāgatagarbha, while "the way the realized mind stays" I would equate with alāya; however, these are not necessarily the same in some traditions.

So, first I would ask: are these the correct approximations in Sanskrit of those two terms? Second, if so, does Mahāmudrā generally consider these two an equivalent?

Thanks in advance for reading and answering.

Malcolm wrote:

gnas lugs renders two Sanskrit terms: bhutatā and tattva, for example Longchenpa's famed gnas lugs rin po che mdzod is given a Sanskrit title by him: tattvaratnakośa. I do not know why translators from Tibetan persist in translating "gnas lugs" as "way of abiding". Thus it is pretty clear the title of the text ought to be translated "Treasury of Precious Reality".

Gnas lugs in this context simply means "reality".

Ālaya and gnas lugs are equivalent in Mahāmudra teachings in both Kagyu and Sakya.

The third sense of gnas lugs, often overlooked, is "anatomy", for example, when we talk about the rtsa'i gnas lugs i.e. the anatomy of the channels, and so on.

M

Yudron said:

Thank you. I do hope that if you start preparing Dzogchen translations for publication, that you will either have a glossary in the back with this kind of explanation or put the Tibetan in the same volume, so we can know what words you are translating. When you actually give your reasoning, it is really good for stumbling old poor readers like myself, and also for aspiring young translators who can then ask scholars about these specific kind of points.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I made a hasty error -- Longchenpa's text is not the tattvaratnakośa, but the tathatvaratnakosha. Nevertheless, my point is the same.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Mariusz said:

With regard to Madhyamika...well.....not so sure.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsonkhapa because of His the new Prasangika marginalized Yogacara to this Mind Only interpretation. [/quote]

This statement simply ignores and betrays ignorance of the entire history of tenet system literature in India as well as Tibet.

Yogacara was considered "mind only" in Tibet from the eighth century. I suggest you learn Tibetan and read Kawa Paltseg's treatise on tenet systems, not to mention Shantaraksita's Tattvasamgraha which is in English, which negates Yogacara as mind-only and so on.

It was only after the 14th century that a rennovated "Yogacara" was presented by some Tibetan scholars such as Dolbupa, etc. Prior to this, in general, Tibetans in general considered Yogacara "cittamatra". I can provide numerous examples going back to the 8th century.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Contemporary tertons of Eastern Tibet

Content:

Yudron said:

...personally I think it's better to leave Ngakpa Chogyam and his students alone.

Malcolm wrote:

I could really care less anymore, I have no interest in hounding them at all. I was merely confirming what was reported.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 28th, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Mandala prayers

Content:

markadm said:

By the way, I wanted to ask: many prayers require permission or empowerment in order to 'work'. Can I safely assume that anyone could make a mandala offering, even the elaborate (long) one?

Malcolm wrote:

Technically, no. Mandala offerings are connected with Guru Yoga, and come from the Guhyasamaja tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Gelug View of Dzogchen?

Content:

Tom said:

I just have misgivings of the need to classify Dzokchen as a Gelug practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a Gelug practice -- nevertheless, there have been many great Gelug Dzogchen masters such as the great Fifth, Desri Sangye Gyatso, etc., and more recently, Khenpo Acho.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Sūtra, Tantra, & Essence Mahāmudrā

Content:

viniketa said:

Having only an elementary familiarity with both Mahāmudrā and Dzogchen, I recently ran across a book on Mahāmudrā and picked it up to learn more about Mahāmudrā: Brown, Daniel, (2006). Pointing Out the Great Way: The Stages of Meditation in the Mahāmudrā Tradition. It seems a good overview of the Mahāmudrā tradition; I like the way in which the author places the tradition in the history of both Indian and Tibetan Buddhism and in the three major methods of practice: sūtra, tantra, & essence.

As I do not read (or speak) Tibetan, as I thought would happen, I am coming across terminology that seems familiar but that, without a Sanskrit or Pali base, I'm uncertain. For example, the gnas lugs, Brown presents as the "Buddha nature" of mind, or "the way the realized mind stays". Now, Buddha-nature I would equate with tathāgatagarbha, while "the way the realized mind stays" I would equate with alāya; however, these are not necessarily the same in some traditions.

So, first I would ask: are these the correct approximations in Sanskrit of those two terms? Second, if so, does Mahāmudrā generally consider these two an equivalent?

Thanks in advance for reading and answering.

Malcolm wrote:

gnas lugs renders two Sanskrit terms: bhutatā and tattva, for example Longchenpa's famed gnas lugs rin po che mdzod is given a Sanskrit title by him: tattvaratnakośa. I do not know why translators from Tibetan persist in translating "gnas lugs" as "way of abiding". Thus it is pretty clear the title of the text ought to be translated "Treasury of Precious Reality".

Gnas lugs in this context simply means "reality".

Ālaya and gnas lugs are equivalent in Mahāmudra teachings in both Kagyu and Sakya.

The third sense of gnas lugs, often overlooked, is "anatomy", for example, when we talk about the rtsa'i gnas lugs i.e. the anatomy of the channels, and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Contemporary tertons of Eastern Tibet

Content:

Kunzang said:

If I recall correctly, back on e-sangha, Malcolm said that an acquaintance of his had attended a retreat with Namkha Rinpoche who gave a reading transmission of Dudjom's works (I don't recall which Dudjom) and Namkha Rinpoche came across the passage in question and was shocked.

Malcolm wrote:

This is correct -- this was in 2003 while I was at Merigar and a fellow from the Rigzin Sangha, Konchok, if I myself recall correctly, was attending a retreat at Merigar. He was the one who told me this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Mariusz said:

If one can see my quotes from Vasubandhu and Buddha in this way, of course it is not a big problem. Tsongkhapa and others innovators used to like to see them this way of course.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa, etc., is not an innovator in the slightest -- the innovators are people like Dolbupa etc., who have invented a Yogacara that never existed in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Pracjnaparamita in 25,000 lines

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

There are basically two versions of the 25,000 line sutra: the unarranged version that lacks the headings of the Abhisamaya-alamkara and the collated version that possesses the topic headings of the AA.

Am I to expect that the the unarranged version is the version to see as more original in spirit and text, then?

Malcolm wrote:

They are more or less identical. The headings of the AA merely show how the text was read after Ārya Vimuktisena's seminal AA commentary based on the PP in 25,000 lines was written.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 26th, 2012 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Pracjnaparamita in 25,000 lines

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

My general impression is that the Pancavimsatisahasrika-prajnaparamita-sutra is the "standard edition" of this collection of materials, the one that outlines reference, and the one that lay behind the Nagarjuna shastra.

My further impression is that Conze's long 100,000 version is a constructed hybrid. I have always had a high impression of him but I have heard people actually hiss at this.

Is the Pancavimsatisahasrika-prajnaparamita-sutra available in english somewhere?

And does it include the Wisdom chapter?

(Side note: that new interview with Paul Williams is, ahem, a Revelation....)

Malcolm wrote:

The answer, Leo, is no, not yet.

Conzes "Large Sutra" thus is an abridgement of the 18,000 and 25,000 line version. Conze's book is a construction from the 18,000 and 25,000 line version with some comparisons to the 100,000 line version.

There are basically two versions of the 25,000 line sutra: the unarranged version that lacks the headings of the Abhisamaya-alamkara and the collated version that possesses the topic headings of the AA.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 26th, 2012 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It would be more accurate to say that Dzogchen finds the doctrine of the dependent nature faulty. The fault for which the yogacara school is criticized is the assertion the dependent nature is ultimate.

Jyoti said:

The dependent arising nature (依他起性 paratantra-svabhāva) is not considered the same as the absolute nature (圓成實性 parini-panna-svabhāva). The former is the means of the latter (body), only the body is considered as established and therefore ultimate. The two is not consider separate nor same, this is the basis of the two truths.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

The perfected nature (parinispanna) is the non-existence of the imagined nature

(parikalpita) in the dependent nature, that is all. The dependent nature, nevertheless is considered ultimate in Indian Yogacara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 25th, 2012 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?

Content:

Jyoti said:

Dzogchen does not possess the teaching of the three natures, there is danger that it will confuse the dependent arising nature with the imaginary nature.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be more accurate to say that Dzogchen finds the doctrine of the dependent nature faulty. The fault for which the yogacara school is criticized is the assertion the dependent nature is ultimate.

This is identical to the Madhyamaka criticism of Yogacara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

Anyone managed to write down the mantra for the Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol today?

Please pm me, thanks!

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is in the mantra book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Jyoti said:

Free from extremes refer only to the means

Malcolm wrote:
No, it refers to reality.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 9:34 PM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen really beyond cause and effect?
Content:

Tiger said:

And then claiming that the Buddhahood of Dzogchen is "self-emergent" or "spontaneous" and "beyond cause and effect", you contradict the first statement because a Guru's empowerment was logically concluded to be a necessary requirement in your sect. Either the requirement for Guru is indispensable for your goal (and your realization is NON-spontaneous) OR your vehicle leads to the arousal of "Buddhahood" spontaneously. It cannot be both at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhahood in Dzogchen is analgous to picking fruit off of a tree. You need a Guru to show you where the tree is and that the fruit is there to be picked. You need do nothing to grow the fruit, however -- it is just hanging there to be picked.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 12:16 AM
Title: Re: Anyone here practicing Vajrayana without a Guru?
Content:

lobster said:

A path that is no path at all . . .

Sounds ideal . . .

Malcolm wrote:
Krishnamurti, etc., is aisle three, under Eastern Philosophy, along with the Eckhart Tolle, Adhyashanti and pop Zen books.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 24th, 2012 at 12:05 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:

Jyoti said:

These are just play of names which are without the meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

People in glass houses ought not throw stones.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 23rd, 2012 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Anyone here practicing Vajrayana without a Guru?

Content:

lobster said:

Some practices such as Chenrezig, Tara and quite few others are complete paths, dependent on your sincerity.

Malcolm wrote:

Without transmission from a guru, these are not paths at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 23rd, 2012 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Anyone here practicing Vajrayana without a Guru?

Content:

Daniel83 said:

My question would be if there are actually people who practice Vajrayana without a teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is no such a thing. Everyone who practices Vajrayāna does so having received transmission from a Guru.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Pronunciation of "ai" in Tibetan

Content:

Sherlock said:

When is "ai" pronounced /ai/? In ChNN's own name for instance, it is usually pronounced /ai/ but in other instances involving the genitive of namkha it is pronounced /namkhe/.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on where you are from in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Svasamvedana

Content:

Will said:

So Malcolm, this translation (and notes) of the Three Statements is pretty poor?

"faith in Self-Reflexive Awareness" for example?

<http://www.dharmafellowship.org/library/texts/three-statements.htm> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yes... especially considering that they are missing have the text which occurs before the three statements themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Direct Introduction online?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He offers direct introduction with every webcasted retreat, not just three times a year.

23rd Sept. 10am-12pm.

Give a Donwang of Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol.

This contains direct introduction.

There is an open webcast which started today at 4 am eastern time -- I suggest you get up and listen.

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

21st -27th September 2012

Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol

the terma teaching of Ridzin Jyangchub Dorje.
OPEN WEBCAST. Timezone: GMT+2

21st Sept. 10am-12pm.

Introduction about this Teaching and the transmission of Ati Guru Yoga related with the tridlung of Short Thun Practice.

monktastic said:

I just noticed this morning that I missed the first session (2 AM MDT). If the DI takes place on Sep 23., I will attend tomorrow and Sunday's sessions! BTW, how did you discover that the DI takes place on the 23rd? From the description bolded above? (If so, it's not something I would/could have discovered!)

Also, if I register as a member of the Community, it seems I can listen to / watch old webcasts. Does that mean I can listen in on old Direct Introductions? Does this even make sense if it's not real-time?

Thanks,
M

Malcolm wrote:

I have received this transmission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Direct Introduction online?

Content:

monktastic said:

Hi all,

I'm practicing semi-self-taught Mahamudra right now, and I understand that it's not a good idea. So I'll be finding myself a guru.

I have a question about the Direct Introduction / Pointing Out Instruction. I know Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche offers direct transmission three times a year, and I will attempt to sit in on the November one. It sounds like it may be harder to receive online, and even harder if I only get an audio feed. Is this a reasonable concern? Do people actually recognize rigpa in this way, or is it much better to receive it in person? With any luck, I'll be doing that soon anyway, but that will probably happen later.

Thanks,
M

Malcolm wrote:

He offers direct introduction with every webcasted retreat, not just three times a year.

23rd Sept. 10am-12pm.

Give a Donwang of Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol.

This contains direct introduction.

There is an open webcast which started today at 4 am eastern time -- I suggest you get up and listen.

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

21st -27th September 2012

Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol

the terma teaching of Ridzin Jyangchub Dorje.

OPEN WEBCAST. Timezone: GMT+2

21st Sept. 10am-12pm.

Introduction about this Teaching and the transmission of Ati Guru Yoga related with the tridlung of Short Thun Practice.

22nd Sept. 10am-12pm.

Giving more detail explanation about the teaching of Zhitro and its different methods.

23rd Sept. 10am-12pm.

Give a Donwang of Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol.

24th Sept. 10am-12pm.

Giving instruction about the essential practice of the Zhitro Khordas Rangdrol.

25th Sept. 10am-12pm.

Giving instructions how we do the practice of Zhitro for the living and dying people.
12,30pm - 1pm. We do a Short Gana Puja for the day of Guru Rinpoche.

26th Sept. 10am-12pm.

We do the practice of Jyangchog for all dead people who we have good or bad relations.

27th Sept. 10am-12pm.

Giving some advices for the daily life practices and tridlungs of collective practices and so on. We also do an Ati Guru Yoga altogether for finishing our retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 22nd, 2012 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Svasamvedana

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm,

Is rang rig or rig pa the translation of this "self-awareness" term?

Malcolm wrote:

rang rig pa/svasamvedana means "reflexive knowing", and it is theory of cognition usually considered to have originated with Dignaga and Dharmakirti.

Will said:

But is it not important in Dzogchen, even Garab Dorje's (or Patrul's comments) Three Words using it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, svasamvedana is different i.e. it is rang gyis rig, self-knowing.

Rang rig in Dzogchen is rang gi rig, one's own, and is derived instead from another Sanskrit construct: atmyavedana, and in turn this is part of a long phrase, very common in Sanskrit, pratyatmyavedanajñāna or in Tibetan so sor rang gi rig pa'i ye shes i.e. personally known wisdom. This is what the rang rig means in Dzogchen i.e. one's own knowledge, wisdom that was not learned from another but arises from one's own experience.

The translation of Dzogchen tantras and texts is still in its infancy, and the 95 percent of them should not be trusted by people who do not know Tibetan, including my own translations.

As is the case with much tantric literature, the root tantras of Dzogchen cannot be understood completely without commentaries. But, within the past ten years or so, six seminal commentaries on the man ngag sde tantras attributed to Vimalamitra have come to light.

Earlier translations made without recourse to these commentaries will be somewhat

inaccurate automatically -- it just cannot be helped and there is no reason to blame anyone for honest efforts carried out with insufficient supporting commentaries. But it must be understood that good translations of Dzogchen texts into English are a desiderata. My own efforts are merely a preliminary. I am sure that after I am gone, they will be picked up, picked over, polished or discarded as the case may be in the quest to make clearer and more accurate translations that conform to the definitions and explanations of key points of Dzogchen teachings found in the tantras and commentaries themselves.

In addition there is a wealth commentarial material in the Vima Nyinthig that needs to be digested well.

Maybe in 10 years we will start to have fully accurate, fully nuanced translations of Dzogchen texts that are widely available. Frankly, most Tibetan lamas do not really deeply understand these tantras and their language even if they understand Dzogchen in general perfectly well (moral of story: you do not have to be an expert on the 17 tantras to achieve rainbow body).

For example, today I am working on a citation from the klong drug about nature, essence, and compassion which is literally 1.75 folios long. It is so dense, it cannot be unpacked or understood, let alone translated, without the commentary (which I have, fortunately). In this translation this long and important passage will have to be extensively foot noted with explanations from the commentary (or an appendix, since it covers some 7 long folios). Longchenpa is no help at all, since his method is to merely make a point, and then unleash a long citation from a root tantra with virtually no explanation of the meaning of the passage. In fact in his commentary which closely follows the commentary I am working on (i.e. the tshig don mdzod), he skips this passage entirely because it is so hard to understand without the commentary, or so I am convinced, because for the most part he merely follows the citations as given in this earlier work in the exact order they are presented in that latter.

Back to work...

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 21st, 2012 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Svasamvedana

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm,

Is rang rig or rig pa the translation of this "self-awareness" term?

Malcolm wrote:

rang rig pa/svasamvedana means "reflexive knowing", and it is theory of cognition usually considered to have originated with Dignaga and Dharmakirti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 21st, 2012 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Six Types Of Mindfulness in Dzogchen?

Content:

Sönam said:

Bhumis in Dzogchen? ... does he "really" talks about Dzogchen?

mutsuk said:

Of course he talks about Dzogchen. There are 16 bhumis in Dzogchen, defined in the Rig-pa rang-shar and elsewhere (Longchenpa, etc.).

Skywalker said:

Sorry, I am just a humble fool regarding philosophy, but I heard otherwise from a student of Mr. Norbu. I was told that in Dzogchen there is only one Bhumi. Either you recognize the mind of clear light and are in Rigpa or you don't. I am not trying to disagree with you here, I am just pointing out a contradiction which comes to me. Being quite ignorant of the intricacies of Buddhist and Dzogchen philosophy, I am eager to learn.

Malcolm wrote:

Both are correct. There is only a single bhumi; and in there are also sixteen bhumis. There is a single stage from the point of view of reality, and sixteen stages from the point of view of experience on the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 21st, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Ok good. So the sense in which Dzogchen and Yogacara are different depends on whether a genuine difference exists in terms of this understanding about the 8th consciousness. If they have the same view about this 8th consciousness then they would be saying the same thing. Is this a fair assessment? We are not trying to establish superiority here, but we are interested in whether Dzogchen does in fact share the same view as Yogacara. Is this okay?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. Yogacara is a species of non-dual realism.

Mariusz said:

Again it. Cittamatra of course, but Yogacara is never a species of realism or nihilism as Madhyamaka is either. It was discussed in the past forums already. Yogacara and

Madhyamaka relies on the analysis until its collapse beyond all extremes in the end.
Dzogchen relies on Direct Introduction into Rigpa since the start.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, we do not agree. I do not accept that there is a so called Indian Yogacara that is not cittamatra, despite whatever confusion some Tibetans and Westerners have about this issue.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 20th, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Ok good. So the sense in which Dzogchen and Yogacara are different depends on whether a genuine difference exists in terms of this understanding about the 8th consciousness. If they have the same view about this 8th consciousness then they would be saying the same thing. Is this a fair assessment? We are not trying to establish superiority here, but we are interested in whether Dzogchen does in fact share the same view as Yogacara. Is this okay?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. Yogacara is a species of non-dual realism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 20th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sutras and Tantras

Content:

Tiger said:

Here, Malcolm, this is the Translator's note of Vajra-Suchi, that I was referring to, which shows that Brahmins usually were prejudiced heavily against Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Brahmins were indeed intellectually biased against Buddhism, but their bias was not colonial. Western bias against Hinduism is colonial, and not intellectual. In other words, Hindu problems with Buddhism are based on Buddhist denials of a creator and so forth. Western problems with Tibetan Buddhism and Hinduism have to do with what Westerners see as grotesquery in Hinduism and Tantra Buddhism, and the bias against both Tibetan Buddhism and Hinduism has everything to do with Protestant reactions to the British and German encounter with Indian culture in the early nineteenth century; reactions and attitudes that to this day still infect unbiased study of both Hinduism and

Tibetan Buddhism, as well as Bon, Taoism, Shinto, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 20th, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Difference between Sutras and Tantras

Content:

Tiger said:

Malcolm,

Your post shows more similarities between Tantras and Sutras than differences. Why were the Tantras called "Tantras" instead of "Sutras"? Their format is similar to the Sutras and they contain discussions on Dharma, practices, moral discussions etc just as Sutras do.

Malcolm wrote:

"Yes, because they [tantras] also contain yogic methods and teachings which must be transmitted in certain specific ways since tantric practice is based on a very specific view of the human body and its role in liberation."

Additionally, the tantras teach a view of emptiness that is more profound than sūtra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ārya-pratyutpanna-buddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhī-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Jyoti said:

佛說般舟三昧經

Buddha Pronounces the Sūtra of the Pratyutpanna Buddha Sammukhāvasthita Samādhī:

"What should they do in order to achieve self-fulfillment, free from sycophancy and flattery and unattached to the Three Realms of Existence? "

The above passage is indication that this is not a scripture of definitive meaning. The Maharatnakuta

sutra stated "If any scripture, there is a saying that show: revulsion against samsara and inclined

toward nirvana, is non-definitive."

Try to rely on any recognized scripture of definitive meaning if you want to compare the perspective of sutras with dzogchen tantra.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

The sutra in question is part of the Ratnakuta collection. We already discussed this -- we don't agree what "sutras of the definitive meaning" are and there is no agreement on this point between yogacara and madhyamaka either.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

anjali said:

Hmmm. What does "strictly" mean in your comment, "Because the nature of the mind for sutra is strictly emptiness"?

I like your quotes, particularly, "The wise are liberated by knowing the phenomena's empty luminous nature in that way."

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on how you use "nature" -- in this case what I mean is that the ultimate nature of the mind for sutra is absence of any nature, as demonstrated by my citations -- that does not conflict with the capacity of the mind to know or be aware etc., as demonstrated by my citations, not even does it contradict the that mind is ultimately the buddha when it knows its own nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Josef said:

Chinul may state that mind-essence includes both awareness and emptiness but he is still missing the third part, thugje.

Thus no lhundrub, thus the two are clearly different definitions of nature of mind.

anjali said:

Elsewhere he states that the mind-essence has the three properties of a mirror: ground, luminosity, and capacity (to reflect anything). People can come to whatever conclusions they want: the same, different, both same and different, neither same nor different.

Malcolm wrote:

Also the common sutra has ādarśa-jñāna i.e. the mirrorlike wisdom.

Also Hindus use the metaphor of the mirror. Surely you are not going to equate Shankaracarya and Chinul?

Further the example of a mirror is used over and over again in sutra teachings. Surely you are not going to assert Dzogchen exists in sutra?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because the nature of the mind for sutra is strictly emptiness. Lhundrup is never mentioned nor implied in sutra at all in any way. The understanding of mind (sems, citta) in Chan/Sutra is completely different than in Dzogchen for that reason.

But you can believe whatever you like, I don't have time to properly correct your misunderstanding. Read Nubchen.

anjali said:

Chinul clearly states that mind-essence includes both awareness and emptiness. Therefore, his exposition can't be considered strictly sutra. I will take a look at Nubchen, if I can find a good english translation.

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think the nature of the mind being both empty and aware is not a sutrayāna perspective? It in fact is.

In the sangs rgyas kyi gtsug tor dpa' bar 'gro ba'i mdo it states:

"Next, from stabilizing clear and empty mind, it only becomes prajñā".

Ārya-sūthitamatidevaputrapariṣcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

"The wise are liberated by knowing the phenomena's empty luminous nature in that way."

Ārya-pratyutpanna-buddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhi-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Buddhas are made by the mind;

are also seen with the mind.

The mind is my buddhahood;
the mind is the sugata.
The mind is my body;
buddhas are seen with the mind.
The mind is my awakening;
the mind is natureless.
The mind is not known with the mind,
the mind does not see the mind.
The mind is not perceived as the mind,
not known as the mind, it is nirvana.
M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 1:06 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:

anjali said:
Why do assert that Chinul is referring to mind when the distinction is clearly made between mind and mind-essence. And Chinul's mind-essence has the aspects we would expect it to?

Malcolm wrote:
Because the nature of the mind for sutra is strictly emptiness. Lhundrup is never mentioned nor implied in sutra at all in any way. The understanding of mind (sems, citta) in Chan/Sutra is completely different than in Dzogchen for that reason.

But you can believe whatever you like, I don't have time to properly correct your misunderstanding. Read Nubchen.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 19th, 2012 at 12:17 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen
Content:
anjali said:
Others may differ on that assessment!

Malcolm wrote:
I am unwilling to agree that the intention of Chinul and the intention of Tulku Orgyen, for example, are the same, based on superficial similarities based on English translations divorced from the original language of the texts cited.

Also, while I am not expert in any sense in Korean, Chinese, etc., I am expert in Tibetan language, especially the language of Dzogchen, as well as Indo-Tibetan tenet systems in general. I have digested Nubchen's differentiation of Dzogchen and Chan in his bsam gtan mig sgron (I suggest you try to as well) -- I therefore see no compelling reason to take your assessment seriously.

The best that can be said is that Dzogchen includes the meaning of Chan, Yogacara, etc., but the reverse cannot be said to be true.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 18th, 2012 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That's the problem with mere comparisons of terms, one loses all nuance.

You neglected to cite Tsognyi Rinpoche in full i.e. "Rigpa is empty in essence, cognizant by nature, and unconfined in capacity. Simultaneously seeing these three is named rigpa."

Rigpa is also beyond mind, etc.

anjali said:

Actually, I was quoting his father. I get that Dzogchen makes the distinction between mind and mind-essence. As Urgyen Rinpoche says, "In every sentient being there is mind. The essence of this mind, whether it is known or not, is rigpa." The nature of rigpa is further elaborated as unconfined empty awareness.

Because of the importance of this distinction in Dzogchen, one can reasonably ask if such a distinction is made in other buddhist systems, perhaps under different terminology. For example, is generally acknowledged that Dzogchen and Mahamudra describe the same underlying nature, just with different terminology.

In the work I cited, Tracing Back the Radiance, such a distinction is made. For example, "your pure mind-essence of void and calm numinous awareness." Here is a more elaborate description of this mind-essence in response to an expository question within the text,

These are examples of apophatic discourse; they are not intended to expose the essence of the mind. If I did not point out that the clear, constant awareness which is present now, never interrupted and never obscured, is your own mind, what could I refer to as being uncreated and signless and so forth? For this reason, you must realize that all the various teachings explain only that it is this awareness which is neither arising nor ceasing and so forth.

...

Voidness means that it is devoid of all signs; it is still an aphophatic term. Calm is the immutable, immovable aspect of the real nature; it is not the same as empty nothingness. Awareness refers to the manifestation of this very essence; it is not the same as discrimination. These three components alone comprise the fundamental essence of the true mind. Therefore, from the initial activation of the bodhicitta until the attainment of Buddhahood, there is only calmness and only awareness, unchanging and uninterrupted. p 164

Thus, the essence of the mind clearly appears to be identified as empty and aware. For someone not looking to pick a nit, this sure seems to be describing rigpa. Now, to get back to the original reason for my comment--essence/function. On top of this basic understanding of mind-essence, with the two notions (functions) of luminosity and unconfined ability to reflect anything (per the mirror analogy mentioned earlier), we see that, although the terminology is different, the underlying framework is essentially the same as Dzogchen--unconfined empty awareness. At least that is how it appears to me.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the same -- the workin Buswell you cited is referring to mind, but ngo bo, rang bzhin and thugs rje refer to the three aspects of the wisdom of the basis that are never involved with mind even for a second. Hence, it is different.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 18th, 2012 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Dharma and Magic: is the latter necessary?

Content:

Tarpa said:

I think this part of Buddhist culture, and I do see it as part of Buddhist culture itself, not ethno geographical cultural baggage, may be de-emphasised in transition to the west so as to make Buddhism more palatable to western acceptance, as I feel vajrayana in some aspects in general has been made a bit more palatable and window shopping friendly beginning with the monastic inclusion of vajrayana to the present as it is presented more in a religious way.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, more palatable to the Western Anti-Hindu colonial morays.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 18th, 2012 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Difference between Sutras and Tantras

Content:

Tiger said:

I am familiar with Sutras (and Suttas), but not much with the Tantras. In what way are both different from each other?

1. Are Tantras exclusively like training manuals of various Yogic and ritual practices unlike Sutras which contain both practices as well as metaphysical, moral and general discussion of Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

No, tantras also present metaphysical, moral and general discussions of Dharma.

Tiger said:

2. Tantras are meant to be secret where as Sutras are meant to be open?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because they also contain yogic methods and teachings which must be transmitted in certain specific ways since tantric practice is based on a very specific view of the human body and its role in liberation.

Tiger said:

How do you Vajrayanists reconcile with this fact?

Malcolm wrote:

I guess if I had decided that the Western historiographical approach to Indo-Tibetan religious history was definitive I would be a bit worried. As I have not, and am not likely to, I can read Indo-Tibetan religious history as framed by western scholars with interest without it impinging my interest in the study and practice of Dzogchen.

Western academic studies of Hinduism and Indo-Tibetan Buddhism are often grotesque examples of colonial bias in action. The whole anxiety of Western and Westernized Buddhists (especially in Western neo-Theravada) about "Hinduism" quite frankly is a result of this colonial bias against Hinduism, just as your post betrays.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 10:55 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Jyoti said:

But even mahayana (including dzogchen) practitioners who strayed to the body will make attempt to weaken the means (intellect), and consequently the fruit will not be higher than those achieved by the arahants and formless meditators.

Malcolm wrote:

This is like talking about water without ever having tasted it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

About how long would it take a Dzogchen practitioner who is between lower and medium scope at best regarding their capacity—yet who also has average or slightly-above-average intellectual-faculties—to learn Tibetan well enough in order to at least 'somewhat grasp' the sense of what is written in the 17 (+2) Dzogchen Upadesha Tantra's?

Malcolm wrote:

20 years. If you ask me in ten years, I will say 30.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 10:30 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have had similar pointless conversations with Astus, who also used this idea of essence/function in order to show how Zen was comparable with Dzogchen or even superior to it.

This idea is strictly Sino-Buddhist, and as you rightly point out, is completely incommensurable with Dzogchen.

anjali said:

The only reading I've done in this area is from the book *Tracing Back the Radiance*, Chinul's Korean Way of Zen, translated by Robert E. Buswell, Jr. Here is perhaps the clearest quote on the nature of essence/function in that work:

The original essence of the true mind contains two types of functions. First, there is the innate function of the self-nature. Second, there is the function which adapts to conditions. These can be compared to a bronze mirror. The bronze itself corresponds to the essence of the self-nature. The brightness of the bronze corresponds to the function of the self-nature. The images reflected because of that brightness are the function which adapts to conditions. Under suitable conditions images can be reflected and manifest in thousands of different ways; but the brightness is ever bright. p.165

From my limited knowledge, this seems to be similar to the notion of ground/luminosity/unconfined capacity.

The revelation teaching also employs the two approaches of revelation through

inference and revelation through perception. Hung-chou notes, "The mind cannot be pointed out; it is through such properties as capacity for speech and so forth that we can prove its existence and become aware of the presence of the Buddha-nature." This is the approach of revelation through inference. Ho-tse says straightaway, "Since the mind-essence is that which is capable of awareness, awareness is precisely the mind." To reveal the mind through its awareness is the approach of revelation through perception.

pp. 166

Elsewhere in the work, it is pointed out that the essence of the mind is void. Adding all this up, it seems to be similar to the notion of "empty in essence, cognizant/aware in nature, and unconfined in capacity."

Malcolm wrote:

That's the problem with mere comparisons of terms, one loses all nuance.

You neglected to cite Tsognyi Rinpoche in full i.e. "Rigpa is empty in essence, cognizant by nature, and unconfined in capacity. Simultaneously seeing these three is named rigpa."

Rigpa is also beyond mind, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Can other religions lead to enlightenment?

Content:

viniketa said:

Not every śrāvaka attains śrotāpatti pratipannaka (stream entry), and not every śrotāpanna attains sakadagami (once returner), not every sakadagamanna attains anagami (non-returner) in their own lifetime. This is clear even from the Pali suttas, for example:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an05/an05.202.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an06/an06.086.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an05/an05.179.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this also is an indirect path to liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Can other religions lead to enlightenment?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All nine yānas lead indirectly or directly to liberation. The first yāna, the yānas of gods and humans, includes Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, Shamanism, Taoism, Confucism, etc.

JinpaRangdrol said:

Hmm...this seems like a big assertion. Sources? It was my understanding that the śrāvakayāna was still centered around Buddhadharma, and simply focused on renunciation and personal liberation as an Arhat. Christianity, Islam, etc generally do not promote renunciation (especially not in the 21st century), and do not recognize liberation as a goal. And the very idea of being a "listener" of the Buddha's teachings would clearly be absent in most other religions.

Don't get me wrong, I'd love to believe that all religions lead indirectly or directly to liberation, but I need scriptural sources to back that up.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two presentations of the nine yānas. The sgra thal gyur presentation of the nine yānas combines the śravaka and pratyekabuddha yāna into the one, making it the second yāna, and places the vehicles of gods and men as the first yāna. This is not only my understanding, but it is frequently mentioned by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

The feature of all these religions which makes them indirect paths is that they all extol some variation of the ten virtues. The practice of the ten virtues leads to higher rebirth. Therefore, they are indirect paths to liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 17th, 2012 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Since the concept isn't known in any source in Sanskrit using it as a kind of key-term, since everything you say revolves around this concept, to defend Yogacara is an error. I would even say that it makes most of your posts off topic.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I have had similar pointless conversations with Astus, who also used this idea of essence/function in order to show how Zen was comparable with Dzogchen or even superior to it.

This idea is strictly Sino-Buddhist, and as you rightly point out, is completely incommensurable with Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Jyoti said:

What errors? What ignorance?

According to what is being analysed through the theory of ti-yung. Various examples are in previous posts.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

Essence/function is irrelevant to Dzogchen teachings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So Jhoti what is it that you want? What do you want to happen? Do you have a goal in mind?

Jyoti said:

The intention is to clarify errors as well as ignorance within teaching of individual and tradition with words that may be useful.

Jyoti

Andrew108 said:

What errors? What ignorance?

Malcolm wrote:

Her own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 7:24 PM

Title: Re: sanskrit translation of "rNam Dag"

Content:

namoh said:

Actually, at the risk of splitting hairs, Vishuddha seems to also mean Yangdak. Does it simply serve double duty?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 7:24 PM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth in the triple realm. What else could possibly matter?

M

tomamundsen said:

Being able to help sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

That happens automatically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Dharma and Magic: is the latter necessary?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

On the other hand, it seems in the Buddha's time śramaṇas in the Buddhist community did not directly appeal to such forces, and instead focused on their meditative practices. The Atanatiya Sutta contradicts this perception.

Huseng said:

Interesting. I didn't know about this before.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.32.0.piya.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Interesting that the Buddha is offered this rather than teaching it:

"Bhante, may the Blessed One learn the Atanata[4] protection so that the displeased Yakkhas may be pleased, so that the monks and nuns, laymen and laywomen, may be at ease, guarded, protected and unharmed."

The Blessed One gave consent by his silence. Then the great King Vessavana, knowing that the Blessed One had consented, recited the Atanatiya protection:

When the night had passed the Blessed One addressed the monks: (The Buddha related to the monks word for word what has been said by the great King Vessavana, see above.)

"Learn by heart, monks, the Atanata protection, constantly make use of it, bear it in mind. This Atanata protection, monks, pertains to your welfare, and by virtue of it, monks and nuns, laymen and laywomen may live at ease, guarded, protected, and unharmed."

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did teach it, that is why it is a sutta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 16th, 2012 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Dharma and Magic: is the latter necessary?

Content:

Unknown said:

On the other hand, it seems in the Buddha's time śramaṇas in the Buddhist community did not directly appeal to such forces, and instead focused on their meditative practices.

Malcolm wrote:

The Atanatiya Sutta contradicts this perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Purelands that decay

Content:

zamotcr said:

I always though that the Pure Lands were some kind of a special land where the Buddhas teach the dharma without restriction, a place where we can attain buddhahood without problems.

But it seems that this is not always the case. I have read that every Buddha has a Pure Land, and the Shakyamuni's Pure Land is this Saha world.

So, not every Pure Land is created by a Buddha, like our world, that wasn't created by Shakyamuni, and other Pure Lands are created by merit of some Buddha (like Amitabha's Pure Land, created by his own merits).

In the Lotus Sutra are a lot of examples of Buddha Lands that decay in the hands of Mara, so not every Buddha Land is perfect.

So, why these different, what make each Pure Land so different?
Why some pure lands are outside samsara, and others are inside samsara?

Sorry for my bad english

Malcolm wrote:

The term "Pure land" is wrong. The Sanskrit term is buddhakṣetra which means "Buddhafield" -- some, like Sukhavati, are considered outside of samsara. Some, like the Sahaloka, are part of samsara. However, both the Lotus Sutra and the Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sutra show that the idea of distinguishing between pure and impure buddhakṣetras is based on an error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so what do you do instead of being born in the triple realm?

Malcolm wrote:

Presumably one dallies with celestial viginis, eating grapes and drinking wine.

M

gad rgyangs said:

virgins not for long! but seriously, I'd rather eat ice cream and smoke weed - is that an option there?

Malcolm wrote:

grapes and wine can be viewed as placeholders for a variable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

no rebirth as in "extinction", or no rebirth as in "an improvement in one's circumstances"?

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth in the triple realm. What else could possibly matter?

M

gad rgyangs said:

so what do you do instead of being born in the triple realm?

Malcolm wrote:

Presumably one dallies with celestial viginis, eating grapes and drinking wine.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Can other religions lead to enlightenment?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All nine yānas lead indirectly or directly to liberation. The first yāna, the yānas of gods and humans, includes Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, Shamanism, Taoism, Confucism, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

and if you get rid of the afflictions, what's left?

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth.

gad rgyangs said:

no rebirth as in "extinction", or no rebirth as in "an improvement in one's circumstances"?

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth in the triple realm. What else could possibly matter?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

new2dharma said:

So do buddhists believe in an individual's soul or self? If not what gets reincarnated?

Thanks and Namaste, Dan

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Afflictions.

gad rgyangs said:

and if you get rid of the afflictions, what's left?

Malcolm wrote:

No rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Does the soul exist in Mahayana thought?

Content:

new2dharma said:

So do buddhists believe in an individual's soul or self? If not what gets reincarnated?

Thanks and Namaste, Dan

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 15th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

Pero said:

No, that was the tantra for Yantra Yoga. The song of the vajra is not in this tantra but in the Upadesha tantra of the same name.

simhanada said:

So, for further clarification, we are talking about the Nyida Khajor as one of the 17 tantras? or different?

Malcolm wrote:

The upadesha for Yantra Yoga is Called Nyi zla kha sbyor.

There is also an upadesha tantra, one of the seventeen, called Nyi zla kha sbyor as part of its title.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 14th, 2012 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Back online and upgraded!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

response time is definitely faster -- the old server was experiencing a bit of a lag at times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 14th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Bj Lhundrup said:

Anyone know the names that are used in the TsamDrak & TingKye editions for this tantra that goings by these names?

nag mo khros ma.

khros ma nag mo.

bka' srung nag mo'i rgyud.

bka' srung nag mo'i snying thun gsang ba.

sngags srung gsang rgyud.

These names are not in both those editions and I need to know what title they go by in these two version of the NGB.

thanks

L

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I can tell it is not in the NGB in either of those collections.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But we do not accept Mahayana as definitive. We only accept Dzogchen as definitive, based on what the Buddha has taught in those teachings.

Jyoti said:

This type of claim is precisely the reason the buddha explicitly stated the guidelines on how to distinguish the scriptures of non-definitive meaning from the scriptures of definitive meaning. Therefore, based on those guidelines, no person can undermine the authenticity of the definitive scriptures, or the mahayana that is established by it.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

This is not even very precise -- for example, one Indian school of common Mahāyāna (i.e. Madhyamaka) follows the Akṣayamati-nirdeśa sūtra for ascertaining what is definitive; another (Yogacara) follows the Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra. Both schools also utilize the four reliances from the Kaśyapa-parivarta sūtra. Your criteria therefore is far less certain than you pretend.

When it comes to Dzogchen, Dzogchen is beyond the considerations of common Mahāyāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, in terms of textual history, the earliest tantra by name that we have is the core of the famed Ayurvedic classic, the Caraka Samhita. This text is called Agniveśa Tantra.

The term "tantra" is just a general word in Sanskrit that means effectively "manual".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Shaivite and Buddhist Tantra. Which came first?

Content:

Tiger said:

The Hindus (Shaivites) claim that they founded Tantras and the Buddhist claim that they were the first creators of Tantra. So which one came first?

I found this interesting explanation from

<http://www.kamakotimandali.com/blog/index.php?p=1082&more=1&c=1&tb=1&pb=1>:

The nāgārjuna of vajrayāna is generally identified by the Tibetan Buddhists with the mādhyamika philosopher, but these two were definitely different teachers.

Matsyendranātha, a Tantric teacher of Shaktism, enjoying great reputation as a kaula

yogin appeared in Assam sometime in the early centuries of the Christian era. He is taken as the founder of the Kaula system in kaliyuga. That system is said to have been started by four yuganāṭhas in four yugas and they are respectively khagendranātha, kūrmanātha, meṣanātha and matsyendranātha. arāha alias rāhulabhadra, a Buddhist monk of the vijnānavāda school, learnt Kaula Tantra from some efficient teacher belonging to the line of matsyendranātha. He adapted it to the fundamental principles of vijnānavāda and presented it efficiently as a secret sādhana taught by Buddhism. He eliminated cleverly two very important principles of śākta tantra for such purpose. One of these is the principle of the existence of a constant entity called ātman. The other principle is that of absolute theism. Besides, he changed the names of Tantric deities so as to make them look like Buddhist ones and gave all philosophical terms a Buddhist coloring. Thus he presented the śākta system of matsyendranātha as mystic Buddhism and gave it the name, vajrayāna. One of his very efficient disciples was a monk named nāgārjuna who also is, many a time, wrongly identified with the ancient mādhyamika philosopher of the South by the Lamas of Tibet and Mongolia. He popularized among Buddhist monks such Tantrism which passed on under the name of vajrayāna Buddhism. Padmasambhava, a disciple in his line, carried such Tantric Buddhism to Tibet and from there it spread to many countries of the Buddhist world.

How true is the above account?

Malcolm wrote:

It is very speculative. In any case, Buddhist tantras are primordial.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara and dzogchen

Content:

Sönam said:

Then we do not have the same view on what's definitive ...

Sönam

Jyoti said:

This is not my view, it is the sutra's view about what is definitive, so anything outside this sutra's view that does not come from the Buddha cannot be relied. Note the instructions of the four reliances of mahayana.

Jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

But we do not accept Mahayana as definitive. We only accept Dzogchen as definitive, based on what the Buddha has taught in those teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

In 3 separate places I've found 3 different deities being referenced to as the black wrathful goddess in the "Black Wrathful Goddess Tantra"...

In the OP I copied the run-down of the 17 Tantras from a website which listed the Black Wrathful Goddess Tantra (nag mo khros ma); as referring to a black form of Vajrayogini (khros ma nag mo).

In another more in depth run-down I found done by Khenpo Ngakchung it lists this tantra as the Tantra of The Wrathful Black Guardian Shri Ekajati, which resembles a sharp razor, describes how to protect the practitioner against harms inflicted by others. Obviously referencing Ekajati.

And then on Vajranatha's website he has this as referencing Simhamukha: The secret sadhana (gsang sgrub) is for the exceedingly wrathful black Krodha Kali Simhamukha (khros-ma nga-mo), "the wrathful black goddess", who appears to annihilate the delusion of ego, symbolized by the insatiable demon king Rudra, much like Durga cutting the head off the demon king Mahisha. The secret sadhana is also connected with the practice of Chod (gcod), the severing or cutting off of the ego. For this reason, this form of Simhamukha is also called Vajra Nairatma (rDo-rje bdag-med-ma), "she who destroys the notion of an ego."

Which deity is actually being discussed in this tantra?

Malcolm wrote:

Mamo Ekajati. The confusion comes from the fact that the tantra is called "khros ma nag mo", which is also the name of several other cycles of unrelated devas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Did Shakyamuni Buddha also give empowerments?

Content:

Tiger said:

it is the Vajrayanists first who have claimed to be most supreme...

Malcolm wrote:

No, that would be Gautama Buddha, who proclaimed that only through his Dharma and Vinaya would one attain buddhahood, then came Mahāyāna (Perfection of wisdom sutras, etc.), then came Yogacara, third turning; then came general mantras, then annutarayogatantra, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Did Shakyamuni Buddha also give empowerments?

Content:

Tiger said:

If empowerment from a Guru is required to attain Anuttarasamyaksambodhi, then why is it called Anuttara samyaksam bodhi to begin with? Our Buddha is often described as a fully self enlightened one and this is because he attained enlightenment through his own efforts.

Malcolm wrote:

Anuttarasamyaksambodhi means "unsurpassed perfect full awakening"-- there is nothing about the term, from a Mahayāna perspective that suggests that the Buddha was "self-enlightened".

We can see that gurus are intended to be respected in common Mahāyāna as well:

Ārya-mahākaruṇāpuṇḍarīka-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra shows that in the past when the Buddha was a bodhisattva he relied on a guru

Ananda, As such, in the past when I practiced the conduct of a bodhisattva I bowed fully bowed and prostrated to a Guru.

The buddhas arise in the world as gurus, as Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra clearly states:

Limitless amazing victors

produce loving minds to benefit the world;

since they arise as guiding Guru teachers,

from now on they will attract disciples in the ten directions.

And also recommends that:

The wise generate devotion to a guru

Ārya-sarvadharmasvabhāvasamatāvipaṇcita-samādhirāja-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra recommends:

Serving the guru with noble intention,

doing whatever he asks just as he asks,

one should serve Dharma teachers without interruption,

such is the precept of the victor.

Ārya-sāgaramatipariṣcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

Two Dharmas to esteem:

serving the spiritual friend

and relying on the guru with devotion.

We can see from just this small sampling of important Mahāyāna sūtras how important it is to rely on a guru in common Mahāyāna in order to achieve

Anuttarasamyaksambodhi. There are many other similar statements made in Mahāyāna sūtras. So we must understand that relying on a guru is critical for achieving buddhahood.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 5th, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Did Shakyamuni Buddha also give empowerments?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

So even in regular Mahayana there is a tantric-like empowerment that is given by the rest of the Buddhas when you are on the appropriate bhumi.

Thats what I'm understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

It takes place through light rays, but yes, effectively the Vajrayāna principle of empowerment is validated by Mahāyāna sutra. The principle difference of course is that the empowerments of the former system can be granted to ordinary persons, while the empowerments of the latter system are reserved for tenth stage bodhisattvas.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 4th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Did Shakyamuni Buddha also give empowerments?

Content:

Tiger said:

1. Vajrayana practitioners consider higher Tantras/Yogas (Mahamudra, Dzogchen etc) as the ONLY method to attain Buddhahood (correct me if I am wrong here). Which is why I asked if Buddha Shakyamuni also delivered empowerments.

Malcolm wrote:

Anuttarasamyaksambodhi is only possible through empowerment -- this is why for example abhiśeka is mentioned as a key feature of buddhahood in the Āvataṃsaka sūtra and so on.

When a bodhisattva attains buddhahood, they do so on the basis of an empowerment (abhiśeka) transmitted through from all the tathagatas of the ten directions. For example, the Buddhāvataṃsaka-nāma-mahāvaiṣṭya-sūtra states:

Whoever attains facility through the supreme samadhi, they completely receive the ornaments of the empowerment conferred from the victors of the ten directions

Ārya-tathāgatācintyaguhyānirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

By attaining empowerment, one is endowed with all qualities.

Ārya-svapnānirdeśa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

On the tenth stage one is predicted as a buddha through empowerment

Āryākṣayamatiparipṛcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Since the tenth creation of bodhicitta is the empowerment that grants power over qualities, wisdoms and all phenomena, it is seen to be equal with space through the example of the name "cakravartin".

Ārya-ratnacūḍaparipṛcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

All who are impeded by a single birth obtain empowerment.

Ārya-lalitavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Through possessing love and compassion, the bodhisattva who has been conferred the empowerment of merit and wisdom leaves Tuṣita.

Thus, empowerment in Vajrayāna, the direct route to experiencing anuttarasamyaksambodhi in a single lifetime in a single body, is fully validated by Mahāyāna sutras.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 4th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Marihuana and meditation

Content:

TaTa said:

The mindfulness has drastically reduce the "wanting" part of the addiction but still i cant seem to not smoke when someone lights one up around me.

Malcolm wrote:

Avoid people who smoke herb.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 4th, 2012 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Why is dependent origination so important?

Content:

Music said:

Why is it important to know? What does it mean to know, anyway? We all know that everything is connected with everything else ...

Malcolm wrote:

It is important for understanding how suffering arises, so it can be undone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

Sönam said:

and there is a precise tempo, wether slow

(http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/files/SOV_SLOW.pdf) or fast

(http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/files/SOV_FAST.pdf) ... it is not supposed to be sung otherwise.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are being a little too rigid there, Sonam. Even ChNN does not sing SOV the way Adriano has transcribed it.

Pero said:

Yeah hahaha. As far as I understood Adriano in that webcast that's the way it's supposed to be in done in the dance of the vajra because it's coordinated with movements. When alone I try to sing it as close as I'm able to the way Adriano taught it then, but we don't sing it quite like that with Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

I follow the boss.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Yudron said:

Jim Valby was kind enough to send me a CD of the 17 main Dzogchen tantras input into Wylie. My intention is to eventually use Tibet doc to change them into u-chen. I have not proofed any against the original yet.

I really appreciate his generosity.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking I use the Adzom Chogar recension for convenience, but I have found that many respects the Tsham Brag recension of the 17 to be more accurate, at least when it comes to comparing root text with commentaries.

Yudron said:

Thanks! I'm really in over my head here: I don't know what the tsham brag edition is. Is that on TBRC?

I was assuming they were in the nyingma gyud bum.

Malcolm wrote:

There are three Nyingma rgyud 'bums: Ting skyes, Tsham brag and Derge (Adzom Chogar).

The first two share a common root, and the last is a separate tradition.

IN reality, you need all three. For example, the Rig pa rang shar version found in the Derge lineage was collated out of three manuscript traditions, and all three are represented here in the mchan 'grel i.e interlineal notes. These notes are absent from the first two collections of tantras.

I am presently working on translating all 17 tantras into English. When they are published, if they are published, it is quite likely I shall insist that they can only be made available to those people who have received at minimum either the Vima Nyinthig or Khandro Nyingthig empowerments or equivalents, and the complete lung for the seventeen tantras themselves. They will also cost a lot of money. Please do not ask me for them, I am not presently distributing them to anyone so I will just ignore you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Which Of The 17 Dzogchen Tantras Have Been Published?

Content:

Yudron said:

Jim Valby was kind enough to send me a CD of the 17 main Dzogchen tantras input into Wylie. My intention is to eventually use Tibet doc to change them into u-chen. I have not proofed any against the original yet.

I really appreciate his generosity.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking I use the Adzom Chogar recension for convenience, but I have found that in many respects the Tsham Brag recension of the 17 to be more accurate, at least when it comes to comparing root text with commentaries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

Sönam said:

and there is a precise tempo, wether slow

(http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/files/SOV_SLOW.pdf) or fast

(http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/files/SOV_FAST.pdf) ... it is not supposed to be sung otherwise.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are being a little too rigid there, Sonam. Even ChNN does not sing SOV the way Adriano has transcribed it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

heart said:

]

I don't either think its positive, it is a sign of the degenerate times we live in.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense -- it is perfectly fine. The more people who see the video the better. The words of SOV are liberation through hearing all by themselvs, no matter how good the melody, etc.

M

heart said:

yeah, and the video is also a fine piece of art.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is pretty silly, but harmless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

heart said:

No, the melody ChNNR sing the SoV is actually part of the terma which he received from Ekajati, if I understood correctly.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, the melody for SOV first came to ChNN in a dream when he was eight years old --no connection with his later Ekajati terma, which is connected with Mandarava.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

Sönam said:

It seems you all agree to say it's a positive thing ... sorry, I don't, and it is not insignificant too.

mutsuk said:

I don't think it's positive either. I would have preferred a perfectly sung version of the traditional melody with someone with a nice, extra nice and deep voice. That is something practitioners would love to have and it would easily sustain contemplation...Any good (DC traditional) recording around ? I have a CD from the DC dating back to the 1990s but the sound is ugly and the voice is... too loud (to close to the mikes).

heart said:

I don't either think its positive, it is a sign of the degenerate times we live in.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense -- it is perfectly fine. The more people who see the video the better. The words of SOV are liberation through hearing all by themselves, no matter how good the melody, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: The Song of Vajra

Content:

mutsuk said:

... the traditional melody ...

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "traditional" melody of the Song of the Vajra. Prior to ChNN's transmission, this melody did not exist in any human dimension.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Chinese language and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

The translators had to accommodate all these preconditions in order to convey the purport and function of texts.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you have an obligation to read the guy's book before you comment much further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Females who achieved rainbow body

Content:

mutsuk said:

No they are pretty much different, in terms of "waves of blessings" and capacity to liberate others.

Malcolm wrote:

Here rlabs means " nus pa dang, mthu stobs kyi tshad,...nus rlabs dang ldan pa,...phan rlabs chung ba,...'phrin las rlabs chen,...gom pa rlabs can,...las chod rlabs che ba" not "chu sogs 'gul skabs byung ba'i gnyer ma,...chu rlabs,...rba rlabs,...rlabs mthon por 'phyur ba,...rlabs ris med pa.."

Thus bying rlabs has the connocation of "conferring power..." etc., which is characteristic of its Sanskrit corollary: adhiṣṭhānam

mutsuk said:

I know, I 'm not translating byin-rlabs as wave at all, but referring to the degree of the power of the byin-rlabs.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, I just see a lot of translators doing that based on a false etymology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 3rd, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Females who achieved rainbow body

Content:

mutsuk said:

No they are pretty much different, in terms of "waves of blessings" and capacity to liberate others.

Malcolm wrote:

Here rlabs means " nus pa dang, mthu stobs kyi tshad,...nus rlabs dang ldan pa,...phan rlabs chung ba,...'phrin las rlabs chen,...gom pa rlabs can,...las chod rlabs che ba" not "chu sogs 'gul skabs byung ba'i gnyer ma,...chu rlabs,...rba rlabs,...rlabs mthon por 'phyur ba,...rlabs ris med pa.."

Thus byin rlabs has the connotation of "conferring power...." etc., which is characteristic of its Sanskrit corollary: adhiṣṭhānam

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Chinese language and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

For native Chinese readers the Chinese translations generally conveyed the meaning of the original text.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, I think the thrust of the point is that they were not successful in this project, and therefore, Chinese Buddhism evolved along lines dissimilar to contemporary Indian Buddhism during the same period.

It is hard for you to tell, since you have been educated into Buddhism via western Buddhological hermeneutical criteria and you read Chinese Buddhist material through the lense of an understanding heavily modified through a century of comparison of Chinese texts with Sanskrit and Tibetan.

Nevertheless, I also think Mutsuk is overstating the point, since there are a number of commentaries and small number of sutras that passed through Chinese on their way to Tibetan which are regarded as important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Chinese language and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

Tibetan texts are not necessarily superior to Chinese translations.

Malcolm wrote:

They are generally superior, even from a diachronic perspective that includes textual evolution.

viniketa said:

Superior meaning 'more accurate'...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, more accurate. It is an accurate conceit that nevertheless Sino-Japanese scholars find annoying. But anyone who learns Tibetan and can compare with the Chinese will readily allow that there are advantages to Tibetan translations absent in Chinese translations where an original text cannot be recovered for comparison.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Chinese language and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

Tibetan texts are not necessarily superior to Chinese translations.

Malcolm wrote:

They are generally superior, even from a diachronic perspective that includes textual evolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

My suspicion is that Potala is the same as Tirumala mountain, and that the statue of Venkateswara is actually that of Avalokiteśvara.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 2nd, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

username said:

Potala mountain.

Malcolm wrote:

Potala, Avalokiteśvara's buddhafiield, is in South India:

<http://buddhisma2z.com/content.php?id=317> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return

false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Females who achieved rainbow body

Content:

arsent said:

It looks like she did!

Malcolm wrote:

Nope:

<http://www.treasuryoflives.org/biographies/view/Ayu-Khandro-Dorje-Peldron/13139> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And:

"Near the twenty-fifth, without any sign of illness, we found that she had left her body at the time she would normally be finishing her meditation session. She remained in meditation posture for two weeks and when she had finished her tugdam, her body had become very small. We put some ornaments on it and many many people came to witness it.

"In the second month on the tenth day, we cremated her. There were many interesting signs at the time of her death. There was a sudden thaw and everything burst into bloom. It was the middle of winter. There were many ringsel and, as she had instructed, all this and her clothes were put into the stupa that she had prepared at the Sakya monastery."

I, Namkhai Norbu, was given the little statue of Jamyang Khentse Wongpo and a volume of the Simhamukha Gongter and her writings and advice and spiritual songs. Among her disciples there were few rich and important people; her disciples were yogis and yoginis and practitioners from all over Tibet. There are many tales told about her, but I have written only what she herself told me. This is just a little biography of A-Yu Khadro written for her disciples and those who are interested.

Since ChNN personally was present at her cremation, I don't think we can consider that she attained rainbow body.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Sang offerings

Content:

philji said:

During a sang offering, should the emphasis be on offering all that is wonderful and precious etc to the 4 guests or of offering our own negative emotions and defilements for purification?

Malcolm wrote:

The former and never the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Opening Lha Kang

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

With the striped shirt?

So which one are you?

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Sangha Yungdrung Rignga Ling Netherlands.jpg

After some time our Lha Kang named Yungdrung Rignga Ling was opened on the 26-08-2012 by our Geshela Khorden Lhundup Gyaltsen.

Everybody was very happy that our Geshela blessed our Lha Kang.

Now we have a Sangha and a good filled program.

A Geshela, is like the head of the body.

Without the head the body is death.

Mutsog Marro

KY

Tashi delek,

On the photo i am the second from the left side.

Mutsug marro

KY

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Opening Lha Kang

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which one are you in the picture?

So which one are you?

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Sangha Yungdrung Rignga Ling Netherlands.jpg

After some time our Lha Kang named Yungdrung Rignga Ling was opened on the 26-08-2012 by our Geshela Khorden Lhundup Gyaltzen.

Everybody was very happy that our Geshela blessed our Lha Kang.
Now we have a Sangha and a good filled program.

A Geshela, is like the head of the body.
Without the head the body is death.

Mutsog Marro
KY

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

Perhaps Norbu Rinpoche is teaching more from a mengagde POV even when teaching Longde and Semde.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has said that all he teaches in general retreats is trekchö many times -- so don't ask him to teach it.

Pero said:

What is "it"?

Malcolm wrote:

Trekchö

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

Perhaps Norbu Rinpoche is teaching more from a mengagde POV even when teaching Longde and Semde.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has said that all he teaches in general retreats is trekchö many times -- so don't ask him to teach it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Opening Lha Kang

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So which one are you?

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Sangha Yungdrung Rignga Ling Netherlands.jpg

After some time our Lha Kang named Yungdrung Rignga Ling was opened on the 26-08-2012 by our Geshela Khorden Lhundup Gyaltzen.

Everybody was very happy that our Geshela blessed our Lha Kang.

Now we have a Sangha and a good filled program.

A Geshela, is like the head of the body.

Without the head the body is death.

Mutsog Marro

KY

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

mutso said:

The Zhai lhakhang (Zhwa'i lha khang) where the 17 Tantras were rediscovered...

Malcolm wrote:

Does that still exist?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

by lineage i meant is there a list that goes back to Garab Dorje or the Omniscient One Longchenpa?

oldbob said:

Don't know.

My take (47 years with the Tibetans) is that ChNN Rinpoche is Garab Dorje and the Omniscient One Longchenpa.

Don't need the list.

ob

Malcolm wrote:

According to the dgongs pa zang thal cycle of teachings there are three basic lineages: the long kama lineage; the short treasure lineage, the very short direct lineage i.e. samantabhadra, vajrasattva, one's guru. Of these three, the latter is the most critical.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 1st, 2012 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Ok, what about most sacred Dzogchen site outside India?

Malcolm wrote:

IMO, Samye and Samye Chimphu in Tibet, as username alluded to before, as well as the many caves where Guru Rinpoche etc., did practice in Central Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 31st, 2012 at 10:46 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

Yudron said:

Since most contemporary Dzogchen practitioners base their practice on a terma text of Guru Rinpoche, all the many sacred places of Guru Rinpoche would be appropriate pilgrimage places. In addition to that, Longchenpa and Jigme Lingpa wrote or discovered what are today the most important explanatory texts of the tradition, so the

places they walked and practiced would be very significant.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless the most sacred site for Dzogchen practitioners is Vajrasana at Bodhgaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 31st, 2012 at 10:44 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhgaya.

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Any specific connections to Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 31st, 2012 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Consciousness as just a sticker.

Content:

Nothing said:

Words are just words, it is the meaning behind them that matters most.

However the question is still a valid one.

Malcolm wrote:

A meaning separate from words cannot be meaningfully discussed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 30th, 2012 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Consciousness as just a sticker.

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Jyoti:

Consciousness is not composed of concept, so it cannot be prove or dis-proven by concept. There is no buddhist teaching high or low that is not based on the consciousness as the basis.

(I separate this topic)

So for you, it is clear that consciousness is not just a sticker. For you, if I take out the sticker, I will still be able to see this unnamed consciousness.

Do you know that in 12 links dependent, no. 1 is ignorant, no. 3 is consciousness?

You should see there, because you have ignorant, then you can have consciousness.

If you don't have ignorant, you won't have consciousness.

But our position is different, regardless there is ignorant or know, consciousness is always there.

You remove the sticker, but you hold the unnamed basis as unnamed consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of tallying up rabbit horns, shearing the hair of turtles, and breastfeeding children of barren women.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 30th, 2012 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Bonzhik Khyungnak the first Tibetan Tulku

Content:

Tilopa said:

What I should have said is " maybe, who cares and does it really matter? "

Malcolm wrote:

For Bonpos, a much unfairly maligned and disenfranchised group of Tibetans, yes, it matters quite a lot.

Apparently it mattered enough for you to comment upon it, in the typically dismissive mode so many Tibetan Buddhists have towards Bon.

If you don't care, why even comment at all?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Bonzhik Khyungnak the first Tibetan Tulku

Content:

Sherlock said:

Rongzompa was recognised even earlier as an incarnation of an Indian guru by Atisa IIRC, Bonzhik Khyungnak might be the first recognised Tibetan reincarnation of a Tibetan lama though.

Malcolm wrote:

It is unlikely Atisha actually met Rongzom, but barring that detail, he was held to be an incarnation of Krishnacarya.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 10:41 PM
Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:
Content:

DarwidHalim said:
There is no Madyamaka there, there is no Dzogchen there, there is no Mahayana there, there is no Theravada there. Why should we care about it?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 9:48 PM
Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:
Content:

Andrew108 said:
Then there are those who teach themselves from books and become their own teachers..

Malcolm wrote:
[Serious note] Those sort of people do not achieve rainbow body, or any much, for that matter.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 9:45 PM
Title: Re: Bonzhik Khyungnak the first Tibetan Tulku
Content:

dzoki said:
Well Marpa was recognized as an incarnation of Dombi Heruka

Malcolm wrote:
Posthumous recognitions in Namthars written centuries later hardly count.

What Achard is alluding to is that this is the first textual account we have of a Tibetan being recognized as the reincarnation of a previous [realized] Tibetan Lama.

Just as, for example, Bonpos count their treasure tradition earlier than the Buddhist treasure tradition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 9:42 PM
Title: Re: Bonzhik Khyungnak the first Tibetan Tulku
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

The identification marks him as perhaps the first tulku in any Tibetan religious tradition

Tilopa said:

Yeah right, OK, sure, whatever.....

Malcolm wrote:

While no doubt I am the author of many a rude and uncalled for remark, this was rude, uncalled for and disrespectful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

Huseng said:

We might end up with a situation like in India where most people can't really afford to eat meat (even if they wanted to) and live mostly on lentils and simple carbohydrates like roti or rice.

Malcolm wrote:

That was the situation in North America during the 19th Century. Meat was scarce for many people; chicken and turkey were luxuries because they require grain feed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

username said:

I know, I was agreeing with what you were saying to people. Dzogchen masters try to explain that view in concepts as much as possible though finally it has to be experienced for proper realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, agreed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.elephantjournal.com/2012/08/if-you-eat-meat-you-should-know-what-this-looks-like/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

“This particular steer was bought at auction when it was a calf, after buying the steer, paying for the guy to slaughter and deliver it to the butcher, then paying the butcher, the end cost was about \$2/pound. The cheapest hamburger goes for about \$3.50/lb where I live. He grazed for about 9 months before he was killed.

We now have a few cows and there's a bull that visits when they want a gentleman caller. Last year we kept a calf from one of the cows and just had him slaughtered in June. Cost on that one was just over \$1/lb. I've been told that the quality of the meat is on par with the organic free-range grass fed beef you'd find in high end grocery stores for upwards of \$15-\$20/lb. I've never bought that kind of meat so that's just hearsay...

Grass is cheap, you don't get as much meat and they grow slower, but the meat is lean and delicious. Also the cattle don't seem to get sick when you're not loading them up with grain and regular animal feed, so vet costs are few and far between.

We split the meat with another family since one steer produces a lot. I share some with my family and put the rest into a chest freezer at -10 degrees, it lasts 9 months easy, the ground beef will go a year pretty easy. If it gets too close to being too old we have a big BBQ to use up anything that's at the limit. I also have a lot of it sliced for jerky, probably 20lbs or so out of each steer ends up as jerky...

Once you go grass fed the meat from the store will taste really funny. It's got a much meatier flavor, for lack of a better word. Also leaner, and the fat that it does have has a much better flavor. This steer was split between 2 families, a total of 4 adults and 7 kids. It yielded around 320 pounds of meat which lasted about 6 months.”

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

username said:

I don't think any view can be %100 without concepts.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen "view" means being in the state of contemplation, that is what i was getting at.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The difference in view in the three series is not conceptual, it is experiential.

heart said:

Experience have a tendency to be expressed conceptually in general, I think that might be true for all the nine yanas actually.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Those expressions are not the experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Most Sacred Pilgrimage Site in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhgaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:

Content:

oushi said:

Great example. I will try it next time.

How about developing short and fast answer for sunyata addicts, that will easily extinguish their enthusiasm?

Tarpa said:

Sure, tell them to stand in front of a train, since the train, movement, and the person standing in front of it don't exist there should be no problem

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is actually being called "being run over by one's own ignorance"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Or the other one is that there is no killing since there is no soul and anyway, we don't exist. There is no person, animal, being to kill. And the animal, human, being will be reborn, so you can't kill him anyway.

Such rubbish could justify a small killing to even a genocide.

Which of course is poetic nonsense as the Buddha clearly mentioned how all beings suffer and feel pain and how we should not cause them pain or death.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha was merely speaking to those who are ignorant of their own non-existence. Once they understand they do not exist, they will cease to feel any pain. Remember, after all, you only feel pain if you are ignorant. Even that ignorance of course is merely a convention, just like Buddha, in which case we can be free of any struggle at all, now that we have discerned that since neither Buddha nor suffering exist we can all relax... Prasanga Beer!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

it is acceptable to eat meat from an environmental point.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what anyone is saying. It is not acceptable to eat grain fed meat.

David N. Snyder said:

You are advocating pasture raised cattle for slaughter. This is not realistic, especially in a growing population. As Huseng mentions, the population densities are rising. What pasture is available in Bangladesh, for example?

Malcolm wrote:

It is more realistic that McMansions with five acres in subdivisions where even gardening is prohibited, much less raising fowl.

If you want to understand the issues around Indian agriculture, read Vandana Shiva and Annam Bhrama: Organic Food in India. Also read Fatal Harvest if you really want to know how screwed up the industrial agriculture system is. Going vegetarian won't fix it.

In our own country, as I said, massive agricultural reforms to stimulate small farms all over is what is needed to forestall any food supply crises.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

it is acceptable to eat meat from an environmental point.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what anyone is saying. It is not acceptable to eat grain fed meat.

It is also not necessary, or would not be necessary since Government regulations in the US, and so called food safety laws (which are actually unsafe) make it impossible for farmers to butcher steers, fowl and so on on their farms.

The Food Gestapo in the USA make alternatives to large-scale feedlot etc., production prohibitive.

Food production is one area where we need much, much less regulation than what is currently in place, and smarter, scalable regulation so that small producers are not regulated out of entering the market.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Ok we all can agree that

Mengagde nyingthig / yangti >>>>other Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

If you cannot understand it, man ngag sde is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, long sde is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, atiyoga is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, anuyoga is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, mahayoga is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, yoga is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, upa is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, kriya is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, the bodhisattva yāna is completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, the śravaka and pratyekabuddha yanas are completely useless.

If you cannot understand it, the vehicle of tirthikas is completely useless
If you cannot understand it, even the vehicle of gods and men is completely useless.

Therefore, the supreme vehicle for you is the one you can understand and practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:

Content:

conebeckham said:

My son's name is Karma....as to how he works, well.....

He's a recent graduate. Need I say more?

Malcolm wrote:

In reality you do not have any son. Why, because if you had a son, then your son must have inherently arisen, but since there is no inherent existence your son cannot have arisen. Since there is no arising, you do not have any son, because it is impossible that there can be any arising. And we all know that this is what prasanga says, and even that does not say anything...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

yang ti is part of man ngag sde.

SSJ3Gogeta said:

oh yes thats right.

yangti thinks its higher than the innermost secret cycle though.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really; everything in yang ti is in snying thig and vice versa, including dark retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Everything I've seen presents upadesha (mengagde) as the best class.....better than longde or semde.

Actually thats not true, because yangti class claims its even higher?

Malcolm wrote:

yang ti is part of man ngag sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 29th, 2012 at 12:04 AM

Title: How to disrupt any Buddhist conversation:

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Example:

Q: How does karma work?

A1: Karma means intention and what results from intention

A2: There is no karma because karma is just a name...

Conversation sputters and dies and or goes off into long irrelevant screeds about "prasanga" madhyamaka, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

Because of the fact that several methods for recognizing rigpa in mengagde are the same in semde and longde (or vice versa) I see no reason to think it is different across the three series.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, whatever you like to beleive.

Pero said:

But why do you think it's different (without bringing thogal in the mix)?

Malcolm wrote:

You just answered your own question. There is also the fact that sems sde does not result in rainbow body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

Because of the fact that several methods for recognizing rigpa in mengagde are the same in semde and longde (or vice versa) I see no reason to think it is different across the three series.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, whatever you like to beleive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

But if there is a difference in view it should amount to something.

Pero said:

To what do you mean?

Of course I'm not saying there aren't any differences, there certainly are, but rigpa is the same throughout the three series. This is IMO undeniable.

As for the view, I actually don't find the views contradictory but then the explanations of the various views of the three series are not that clear to me. It could be I'm just not smart enough to understand it.

heart said:

In general the way the views are defined in all the nine yanas are quite abstract and to understand them fully I think you have to have a deep knowledge of Buddhist philosophy. Still, the whole idea is that the view gets more and more refined and less conceptual. Even within the Mengakde there are the four cycles that have views that are described in this way as increasingly subtle non-conceptual. Even if it always, even in the lower yanas, it is the same rigpa that we recognize it is obvious that we later might define it conceptually as this or that. I think for example that this is the essential meaning of Karma Lingpas terma translated by John Reynolds as "Self-Liberation Through Seeing with Naked Awareness".

Thank you for the article, it was interesting.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The difference in view in the three series is not conceptual, it is experiential.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 7:06 AM
Title: Re: the drajyor macabre
Content:
conebeckham said:
Hey Malcolm-

Isn't that Manual of Standard Tibetan focused more on colloq.? I've not seen it, but reading the blurbs leads me to believe it's more about spoken Tibetan....??

Malcolm wrote:
It is not exclusively focused on colloquial.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 2:15 AM
Title: Re: World must go vege.
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Grass fed (i.e.natural) beef does not require any grain at all. The solution to food shortages is decentralized intensive small farming.

M

Dave The Seeker said:
I agree with you on this point, but the acres needed to produce beef is pretty significant. One must have enough acres to rotational graze as the previously grazed pasture recovers. As well as for us in the north, where there is winter, a supply of food stuffs to accommodate the months of no growing.
Also the weather plays a significant role as well. This year has shown the proof of that with the drought like conditions all over the US. Without proper water there will be no grass to graze on.

We'll see how the beef prices soar soon. As I know many feed lots that are reducing their animal count due to grain prices going through the roof right now, and still climbing. As well as hay, highest prices in over 10 years, and other sources of fodder not doing well because of weather and the fuel costs to get these products to the feed lot. Beef is becoming too expensive to produce. The cost in the market goes up, but the producers price barely sees an increase.

Malcolm wrote:
Such are the perils of farming. But the gross misuse of industrial agriculture just make it all worse and more perilous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

Nemo said:

40% of corn in the USA is used to make ethanol fuel. That is 1,537,500,000,000 pounds of corn. Enough to feed 1,404,109,589 people a pound of corn three times a day. This percentage will continue to grow by legal mandate. Canada pays over 200 million a year in subsidies in a similar program IIRC. If we stopped using food for fuel we have enough already. These programs have made corn too expensive for Mexicans(ironic as corn comes from and is the main staple of Mexico) who then buy rice. Rice goes up in price and people start starving. I think the powers that be are fine with starving a few hundred million to death by the end of the decade. Going veg is irrelevant if all the extra food is being burned in SUV's.

If you want to make things better you have to grapple with the Great Taboo. Free Market Capitalism. If global capital has no moral constraints the point is moot. Starving people with no money never appear on a corporations bottom line.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The five elements permeate all matter. They are a phenomenological observation about matter, about how we experience matter viz. solids, liquids, gases, heat and dimensionality. This is how they are defined even in Abhidharma, despite the naive atomism that is also found there.

M

Andrew108 said:

Why are they called 'elements'? The term doesn't seem accurate.

Malcolm wrote:

The actual term in Sanskrit is bhūta; in Tibetan, 'byung ba. The meaning is something like "producer". We say "elements" because we don't have a very good English word for translating this concept. We use the term element from Latin "elementum" which means either "principle" or "rudiment" or "first principle, element, basic constituent...".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

oushi said:

Interesting thing happens when you approve such a person analysis, and even encourage him to elaborate more.

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamika bloviation is a common problem on this forum. Stick around long enough and you will likely agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

But then again the 5 element hypothesis is extremely limited (childish even). Scientists seem to have much more interesting and accurate explanations concerning what the universe is made of. Plus they just landed a one tonne mobile science experiment on Mars. I think they win.

Malcolm wrote:

The five elements permeate all matter. They are a phenomenological observation about matter, about how we experience matter viz. solids, liquids, gases, heat and dimensionality. This is how they are defined even in Abhidharma, despite the naive atomism that is also found there.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: World must go vege.

Content:

Huseng said:

Take for example that you need something like 14 kilos of grain to produce 1 kilogram of beef. You could feed a lot more people with the grain than with the beef.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize of course that steers do not naturally eat grain (corn)?

Grass fed (i.e.natural) beef does not require any grain at all. The solution to food shortages is decentralized intensive small farming.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: the drajyor macabre

Content:

Yudron said:

Just memorizing the Tibetan alphabet will go a long way towards helping you pronounce things, although pronunciations are very regional.

Note: Your post seems to be about some text of the Dzogchen Community. The Dzogchen forum is for all Dzogchen people, so please either make DC posts to the DC thread, or be clear in the title of your post what you are talking about, e.g. this one could be "Struggling with English Phonetics for Tibetan Practice Texts" and include us all in.

Thanks.

Blue Garuda said:

Not meaning to be rude, so please take this in the right way - that's a daft idea.

Anyone is permitted to ask a specific question in the Dzogchen forum, including those by DC members about a DC topic.

The rest of DW is the same - staff run it that way.

Single topics do get buried in a huge thread like the DC one, which is very fast moving, and such a topic may be several pages back before even a day has passed.

What if you had a series of questions about your own Guru's teachings and practices - you'd lump the lot into one thread forever?

Unless you place all the topics related to each school in only one special thread as well, across the whole of DW, this is illogical.

Methinks you are being a little over-sensitive. If it isn't of interest to you, don't read it - simple.

Yudron said:

Well, I don't disagree with you that anyone can post on any topic.

I don't know what Tibetan words the "drajyor" refers too, but many Tibetan practices have the same abbreviated name, e.g. lanal for (one of thousands of) lama'i naljyos. Just put a clue in the title, e.g. "help sought with DC community drajyor", and this will be a much more welcoming forum. I'm not the most sensitive person in the world, so if I'm feeling it I'm sure others who are less verbal than I are feeling it as well.

I think everyone wants to be friendly, welcoming and kind, here. We just forget sometimes.

Malcolm wrote:

sgra sbyor meanings "putting sounds together" and is the name of ChNN's transcription system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 28th, 2012 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to stick around a bit longer and observe...

oushi said:

You are probably right, I just wanted to say that the more you pressure madhyamaka proponent, deeper into elaborating he goes. Negation is a starting point of disagreement. Every concept is a sticker, truth is beyond words, so it cannot be tainted by words. Although, words can point to truth, so throwing them away is not wise.

Malcolm wrote:

It is just a practical observation -- I have observed again and again how people misuse madhyamaka analysis to engage in one-upsmanship on internet forums. It is very boring and not the purpose of madhyamaka analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

simhanada said:

FYi yantra is a secondary practice.

How do you understand the differentiation of main and secondary practices Malcolm?

As simple as Guruyoga and everything else?

Or as Magnus suggested Semde, Longde. Mannagde?

Where does Yantra and Dance fall under that schema?

Malcolm wrote:

The only essential practice is ate guru yoga. However, we cannot spend our whole life sounding A, so we have other practices too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Conventional truth is nothing more than just an opinion.

If this universe has substance, this universe cannot work.

Because it doesn't have substance, dependent origination can work.

Because it also doesn't have substance, by convention you cannot say this as such or such.

It is meaningless than to say that this universe is made of 5 elements + consciousness.

Why? Because it is nothing more than just a stricker.

A sticker.

Malcolm wrote:

You need detox from the crack of madhyamaka analysis because it makes a bore to converse with you.

oushi said:

By accepting DarwinHalim view, you would release his karma. By negating it, you create more of it.

This strong madhyamaka approach is not wrong, neither is it right. It is a ladder to no views. We should encourage people to climb it.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to stick around a bit longer and observe...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: the drajyor macabre

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Thanks Malcolm.

And you know what, I'm going to. Could you recommend some decent handbooks, please? I'm afraid I'll have to do it all by myself, at least initially; can't really afford private lessons.

Malcolm wrote:

Manual of standard Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Conventional truth is nothing more than just an opinion.

If this universe has substance, this universe cannot work.

Because it doesn't have substance, dependent origination can work.

Because it also doesn't have substance, by convention you cannot say this as such or such.

It is meaningless than to say that this universe is made of 5 elements + consciousness.

Why? Because it is nothing more than just a stricker.

A sticker.

Malcolm wrote:

You need detox from the crack of madhyamaka analysis because it makes a bore to converse with you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: the drajyor macabre

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Argh.

I've finally decided to teach myself to read drajyor correctly - ChNN stresses time and again that we should learn to pronounce Tibetan words in a way that is at least a bit related to the way they should be pronounced, and he's of course damn right. Enough of this silly pseudo-Tibetan chanting then, let's get down to business properly at last.

So I got meself the Drajyor book and the newly published Mantras and Invocations DVD/book combo, and started to analyse the drajyor transcriptions of the basic things we all know (or thought we knew) and love, such as the seven line prayer or Jigme Lingpa's puja, against the background of Rinpoche's reading them out slowly and clearly.

And it turns out that many of the rules spelled out in the drajyor book just don't make sense. If your apply the rules, you produce an utterance that as often corresponds to what ChNN actually says as it is way off the mark.

Has anyone tried to sort it out? Any guidance, any help? Are there any DOI handouts? A homebrew errata perhaps?

Help me, Dharma-Wheel. You're my only hope.

Btw, I don't speak or read Tibetan, of course, but I'm a philologist. Which is to say, if you want to, by all means get technical.

Malcolm wrote:
Just learn Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 27th, 2012 at 8:27 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
heart said:
Just a small comment, I think when ChNNR says "main practice" he means Semde, Longde and Mengakde. Rushan and Semdzin are actually preliminaries to the Mengakde.
/magnus

simhanada said:
Cool, thankyou for the clarification

Malcolm wrote:
FYi yantra is a secondary practice.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 10:26 PM
Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?
Content:

DarwidHalim said:
Conventionally, we can assume there is substance. But, that is just agreement based on unfound bases.

Conventionally as well, we can assert there is no substance, because by convention you cannot find anything when you separate the things into the smallest size.

Malcolm wrote:
You don't really understand the meaning of "conventional" -- "conventional" means "prior to analysis" for Madhyamaka, whether Candrakirti or anyone else.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 8:46 PM
Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?
Content:

DarwidHalim said:

There is no substance in this universe, not even fire, water, earth, space, wind, and consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally speaking, even in Madhyamaka, the universe is made of five elements plus consciousness, the so called sadadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Music said:

Whatever that substance is.

Jyoti said:

Consciousness (the body) and the seed of consciousness (means). The five elements do not exist apart from consciousness, the manifestation of all phenomena internal and external is due to the perfuming of the various seeds within consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally speaking, even in Yogacara, the universe is made of five elements plus consciousness, the so called sadadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have also been told, in connection with the Tersar lineage that Drollo is considered something like the essence of Kilaya and when I talked with Shenphen Rinpoche, he confirmed that indeed, all the instructions from Namchag Putri concerning Dzogchen etc., were applicable to Drollo since there is no elaborate set of separate teachings on Dzogchen for Drollo.

dakini_boi said:

Is this the case also with tsa lung practices? I.E. the tsa lung from Namchag Putri being applied as completion stage practices for Dorje Drollo?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, precisely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

You can hear Americans from everywhere make statements about some branch of knowledge being useless.

Malcolm wrote:

You might, I never do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Malcolm in the past has said that my observation of these kinds of things is due to a limited experience of the US

Malcolm wrote:

we live in different countries. I don't live in the America you live in.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Having studied all of them except medicine, mathematics and logic are the most useful.

Of course this just means that particular people have particular affinities with different fields of study.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Adhyātma vidya means Buddhism i.e. the inner sciences.

Math does not really mean math as you understand it -- it means calculating calendars, mostly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 26th, 2012 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Dzogchen

Content:

Sherlock said:

The recent Garuda donwang that ChNN gave seems to combine Hayagriva as well as Vajrakilaya too.

Malcolm wrote:

And Vajrapani.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Dzogchen

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=6781&hilit=DROLLO#p80925>

I understand Drollo can be used in the Thuns in place of Guru Tragphur.

Yudron said:

In most Dzogchen lineages, but not all, Drollo and Phurba are practiced separately. In your lama's terma tradition they are together.

Malcolm wrote:

Dragphur that is used in Dzogchen Community is actually a combination of Guru Dragpo, Kilaya, Hayagriva, Yangdag Heruka, Vajrapani and Garuda.

The principle of Dragphur is based on the so called "Son kilayas" of the Kilaya mandala, which is where the lower activities are concerned.

Most major cycles of terma have some form or another of a Tragpur yidam, including Dudjom Lingpa's termas.

Guru Dorje Drollo and Guru Dragpo are generally considered synonymous and often you see the mantra for Dragpo being used for Drollo Sadhanas. When I first receive the Dudjom Tersar tradition of Drollo from Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje, he explained the account of Guru Dragpo subduing Pehar. I have also been told, in connection with the Tersar lineage that Drollo is considered something like the essence of Kilaya and when I talked with Shenphen Rinpoche, he confirmed that indeed, all the instructions from Namchag Putri concerning Dzogchen etc., were applicable to Drollo since there is no elaborate set of separate teachings on Dzogchen for Drollo.

However, it is not the case Guru Dragphur is Drollo combined with Phurba -- ChNN never explains it that way. Dorje Drollo is Dorje Drollo; Guru Dragphur is Guru Dragphur.

They are more less the same in function. But they have different sources. According to ChNN, origin of Drollo is in Bhutan, where Drollo subdued the Bon deity Ati Muwer, and took her as his mount. The origin of Dragpo is Samye, where Guru Rinpoche subdued Pehar.

Further, the place of Paro Taktsang was the site of a tiger god worshipped by the ancient people living there; and Paro Takstang was hit by a flaming meteor which was taken as sign of that god. This ancient memory is referenced in the Padma Srogdrup sadhana of Dudjom Tersar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Trungpa Rinpoche and the Green woman?

Content:

illusionsgame said:

People like that need to be told to go sit.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not your business to condition people one way or another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Drollo is means total integration. When you are totally integrated, everything becomes your servant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Having studied them all, they are useful, especially medicine and adhyātma-vidyā

Huseng said:

What prompted you to study medicine? Was it a long-term interest or something that was sparked at some particular point?

Malcolm wrote:

I became interested in herbal medicine, and then the opportunity arose to study tibetan medicine. Glad I did.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

?

I seem to recall he wrote about her in PV but I'm not home right now and can't check.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but there are no practices in the DC that involve her specifically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 25th, 2012 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

mirage said:

So far I fail to understand how such a thing can be explained without falling into indirect realism of some sort or whatever.

futerko said:

I'm not sure I follow you here, if anything, Buddhism appears to be a form of subjective idealism, at least at a "naive" level.

mirage said:

Most contemporary authors, including Lusthaus whose book I am currently reading, seem very much opposed to the definition of Yogacara as any kind of idealism. So far I do not understand how do they classify it themselves.

But yes, on my current (indeed very "naive") level Yogacara looks somewhat similar to subjective idealism. So, the question is: how can subjective idealism avoid sliding into solipsism (or at least "functional solipsism" - other minds exist, but they are entirely separate and do not interact with our mind)?

Malcolm wrote:

This has been accounted for: mutual traces project a common container universe. This is discussed in the Mahāyāna Saṃgraha at length. If you read that book, your question will be answered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: The Five Sciences and Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

In ancient Mahāyāna there developed an appreciation for the five sciences (pañca-vidyā), a kind of extracurricular set of pursuits that a bodhisattva could pursue for the benefit of beings. They include:

- grammar and composition (śabda-vidyā)
- the arts and mathematics (śilpakarma-sthāna-vidyā)
- medicine (cikitsā-vidyā)
- logic-epistemology (hetu-vidyā)
- philosophy (adhyātma-vidyā)

This perhaps reflects a more intellectual side to Indian Buddhism, but nevertheless the idea is that if someone is able they can and should pursue such studies as it enables a practitioner to further understand and benefit the world while more efficiently operating within it. It may not be directly aimed at liberation, but such knowledges are still useful nevertheless.

So how do you personally feel about studying such subjects? Do you think they would be worthwhile? If you have studied them, do you feel it benefits you as a practitioner? Have you helped others as a result?

Malcolm wrote:

Having studied them all, they are useful, especially medicine and adhyātma-vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?

Content:

Huseng said:

The universe is a result of the collective karma of all beings.

Malcolm wrote:

That is what makes it [collective karma], but that is not what it is made of i.e. like a potter and clay.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

mirage said:

We have a very common example of the situation I am talking about: dreams. In dreams we interact with "people", but they are not sentient beings.

Huseng said:
Sometimes they are.

mirage said:
Maybe. But what matters in this case is that often they are not.

Malcolm wrote:
Only if you decide that the waking state is more real than dreaming, in which case you have sunk your whole position of doubt.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 10:49 PM
Title: Re: Is the universe made of the same substance?
Content:
Music said:
Whatever that substance is.

Malcolm wrote:
The universe and everything it are made of six elements:

Earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 10:44 PM
Title: Re: Rebirth
Content:
Music said:
Wouldn't that mean each person is on a different level?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 10:34 PM
Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
You do not need to make it so complicated. We are communicating right now using words, via a print media i.e. body.

mirage said:
Oh, I do not know about that. I might as well be seeing a kind of a dream, and these words on my screen are just a bit of my karma manifesting, without any other sentient being involved. Probably good karma, but still.

Malcolm wrote:
Don't be silly, it simply a matter of conventional fact.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:43 PM
Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?
Content:
Gyalpo said:
Also many western monks do have photos in robes. Does it make them pretenders?

Malcolm wrote:
The difference, Gyalpo, is that for monks wearing robes is actually part of their vows. The same cannot be said of so called Ngagpas. I have read many fulfillment rituals, I never saw one where a Ngagpa needed to confess not wearing his or her religious gear.

But like Joe said, if you are in a Sangha where the teacher likes his students to wear such things, then it is better to please your teacher.

ChNN thinks such things are pretty ridiculous on westerners, so I don't wear such articles. I prefer the shamanic hippy look.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:36 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
underthetree said:
Slightly off the wall question:

Does ChNN Rinpoche teach a practice of Yeshe Tsogyal?.

Malcolm wrote:
Not that I am aware of.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:33 PM
Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?
Content:

mirage said:

But I find the question of intersubjectivity to be very relevant to the aims of Mahayana. If the ultimate aim is Buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings, then any Mahayana philosophy has to explain how beings can possibly interact with each other.

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained: body, voice and mind.

mirage said:

Sorry, but I do not understand how this answers the question I asked earlier - the example with Eiffel Tower.

Malcolm wrote:

You do not need to make it so complicated. We are communicating right now using words, via a print media i.e. body. If we were talking that would be voice, if we had advanced skills of clairvoyance, we could communicate mind to mind.

We do not need things like intersubjectivity and so on. They are rabbit holes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

futerko said:

The issue of epistemology focuses on the question of knowledge of phenomena which is less of an issue if one's focus of enquiry is the study of the structures of consciousness and the phenomena that appear in acts of consciousness.

Rather than the issue of objective knowledge, Buddhism enquires as the conditions for anything appearing at all - the focus is not about the truth "behind" appearances, but the truth about them.

mirage said:

But I find the question of intersubjectivity to be very relevant to the aims of Mahayana. If the ultimate aim is Buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings, then any Mahayana philosophy has to explain how beings can possibly interact with each other.

Malcolm wrote:

I already explained: body, voice and mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: essential tremor

Content:

Jikan said:

Essential tremor seems to run in my family. I have some symptoms sometimes; these are mitigated by avoiding excesses of coffee and staying present in the moment. I still get the shakes though.

what are the causes of this condition in TM? general advice?

Malcolm wrote:

Without seeing you in person, it is hard to say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is all explained pretty well in the Mahāyāna Saṃhṛaha, from a Yogacara perspective.

Madhyamakas in general accept the outer universe etc., conventionally speaking.

mirage said:

Thanks. Actually, if I am trying to develop the right view to understand Buddhist practice on a deeper level, is it worth it to investigate Yogacara, or should I go straight for Madhyamaka which is considered a superior school? On the other hand, Yogacara seems far easier to understand.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara is much more difficult to understand than Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Offering The First Portion Of Every Meal

Content:

ToddR said:

Hello, been a lurker here for a while but this is my first posting.

I've been wondering how others perform the offerings of the first portion of every meal to the three jewels. Is there a specific procedure that most follow? Also, when eating out, would you bring back the first portion and place it on the shrine?

Any help or comments would be appreciated.

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

You just offer the food before you yourself eat it -- this is called "offering the first portion".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Only in Yogacara. And even within Yogacara in India there were several different schools, half-eggists, true aspectarians, false aspectarians, etc.

mirage said:

Could you please recommend a book or an article, where Yogacara and Madhyamaka viewpoints are explained in a more-or-less accessible way?

Malcolm wrote:

Shared or like traces produce a common container universe.

mirage said:

I understand that similar traces would produce similar phenomena in different mind-streams. But wouldn't it actually just result in two "synchronized" mind-streams, meaning that being A would see phenomena corresponding to being B and vice versa, and they would seemingly interact, but in fact their mind-streams would remain completely independent? I recall reading something like that.

Another example: person A sees an Eiffel Tower, and person B sees an Eiffel Tower. This actually means that phenomenon a1, labelled "Eiffel Tower", appears in mind-stream A, and phenomenon b1, labelled "Eiffel Tower", appears in mind-stream B. Phenomena a1 and b1 are distinct. How are they connected? There is no thing-in-itself which would produce both a1 and b1, connecting them.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all explained pretty well in the Mahāyāna Saṃhāsa, from a Yogacara perspective.

Madhyamakas in general accept the outer universe etc., conventionally speaking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

futerko said:

The idea of an existing thing-in-itself means something unchanging and eternal, and it is this that is disproven, but it does not then follow that phenomena do not appear whatsoever.

mirage said:

True, phenomena do appear, that is obvious. But phenomena appear within mind-streams, right (or mind-streams consist of phenomena, I do not know which is the more correct way to say it)? So we have mind-stream A, in which phenomena a1, a2, a3... appear, and mind-stream B, in which phenomena b1, b2, b3... appear. How are they related and in what manner a material inter-subjective universe can exist?

Malcolm wrote:

Shared or like traces produce a common container universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 24th, 2012 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

mirage said:

But isn't it stated that everything that a being experiences is a result of a ripening karmic seed from that beings alayavijnana?

Malcolm wrote:

Only in Yogacara. And even within Yogacara in India there were several different schools, half-eggists, true aspectarians, false aspectarians, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

What words would you (or anyone else) use to describe the "feeling" of mindfulness from a Dzogchen perspective?

Malcolm wrote:

Mindfulness is just mindfulness -- it simply means that you know what you are doing when you are doing. For example, when typing a post, you know you are typing a post -- it is not different than any other form of mindfulness. The caveat only is that if you are a Dzogchen practitioner, than part of your mindfulness is informed by your discovery of your real nature.

Otherwise, there is no genuinely special form of mindfulness called "Dzogchen mindfulness".

Jeff said:

I agree that mindfulness is just mindfulness (when residing in mindfulness) and everything just feels "normal".

But, when for the first time experiencing (slipping into) mindfulness... Was there no "peaceful" feel of that "easy chair"? My experience has been a "growth" in being able to stay mindful (focused on the moment).

Malcolm wrote:

I suppose you could say there is a kind of a flowing experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

What words would you (or anyone else) use to describe the "feeling" of mindfulness from a Dzogchen perspective?

Malcolm wrote:

Mindfulness is just mindfulness -- it simply means that you know what you are doing when you are doing. For example, when typing a post, you know you are typing a post -- it is not different than any other form of mindfulness. The caveat only is that if you are a Dzogchen practitioner, then part of your mindfulness is informed by your discovery of your real nature.

Otherwise, there is no genuinely special form of mindfulness called "Dzogchen mindfulness".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: How do mind-streams interact?

Content:

mirage said:

Hello everyone,

I am fairly new to Buddhism, so I have some basic questions.

As I understand, in Buddhist thought a sentient being is basically a mind-stream, i.e. a sequence of experienced states (I may be using wrong terminology here). These mind-streams are distinct - they are not all parts of a single universal consciousness, or something. This makes sense - if they were not distinct, we would all have the same experiences.

(I suppose this is a Yogacara position? Madhyamaka seems to be completely beyond me so far.)

My question is: how do sentient beings interact with each other? Because I am getting

the impression that in the described model interaction would be in fact impossible - and how would then Buddhas and Bodhisattvas aid other sentient beings and so on?

Malcolm wrote:

conventionally sentient beings are series of aggregates inhabiting a universe, even for Yogacara. They interact with their bodies and voices on the material level mostly; though some can interact directly through mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

Could you describe how it would be different? Does not a senior student feel light/divine love in the presence of someone who has attained Rigpa? (Divine love "feels" more like a combination of "peace" and "joy" than what we normally describe as romantic love.)

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Divine love?

Dzogchen is nothing like this. Its not like New Age love and light B.S.

Jeff said:

From a post by muni...

Tibetan teacher Tsoknyi Rinpoche describes the layers of self that cover over our "essence love," and the way that mindfulness reconnects us to our true nature.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dmEce-DxTYc> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

But he is not really talking about Dzogchen. What he is describing is from a common Mahāyāna point of view.

The Dzogchen approach to developing compassion is not to cultivate compassion through mindfulness and so on, observing how one feels, etc. The Dzogchen approach is based on discovering one's real nature. Once that is discovered, it is impossible not to have compassion for all sentient beings who are ignorant of their real nature -- that is "essence love".

However, SSJ3 is correct: Dzogchen is not connected with so called New age love and light trips.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

citta santana means "mind stream".

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

/

Right. But I meant - the mindstream is the bindu, correct? I.e. they aren't really different things?

Malcolm wrote:

In father tantra, bindu refers to vāyu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Jikan said:

a practical question on the hair commitment:

It seems to me from casual observation that many Tibetan men who keep this commitment do so with a simple topknot, and it's easy because they have so little hair. Let's say you're gifted in the follicle department: do you keep it in a topknot samurai style? braided and out of the way? or let it dread up for less maintenance? or might it make sense to keep it covered as the Sikhs do?

Blue Garuda said:

And what about the beard?

Malcolm wrote:

It is skra dbang -- there is no need for a beard. Beards are not skra. Skra is the hair on your head, only.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Jikan said:

a practical question on the hair commitment:

It seems to me from casual observation that many Tibetan men who keep this commitment do so with a simple topknot, and it's easy because they have so little hair. Let's say you're gifted in the follicle department: do you keep it in a topknot samurai style? braided and out of the way? or let it dread up for less maintenance? or might it make sense to keep it covered as the Sikhs do?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not matter how you wear your hair. A lot of Ngagpas in Tibet have dreads.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Greg said:

In fairness, it is not entirely clear how grahika and grahya could be nondual and yet cittasantanas are still multiple in some sense. One can also see how East Asian stuff like rocks and mountains having Buddha nature arose - if grahika and grahya are nondual how could they not?

Malcolm wrote:

Cittasantanas are real. Subject and object are not.

Greg said:

I'm still not clear as to how cittasantanas could be real and multiple without being subjects and objects of one another. Multiplicity and nonduality would seem to be mutually exclusive.

Malcolm wrote:

They can be subjects and objects of each other. This is specifically admitted in Yogacara theory. What does not exist is the apparent external world of subjects and objects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 23rd, 2012 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Karma Dondrup Tashi said:

Please excuse the newbie question - I presume in Vajrayana 'citta-santana' is pretty much the same as 'bindu'?

Malcolm wrote:

citta santana means "mind stream".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Asceticism in TB and "The Middle Way"

Content:

Jnana said:

It doesn't matter what kind of teacher s/he claims to be. It's still a ridiculous characterization that doesn't at all describe the monks and nuns that I've known.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the whole statement by Rajneesh, and it has nothing to do with Bhikṣus, actually:

The more cultured and civilised the more dead. If you want to see perfectly dead men and yet still alive go to the monks in the monasteries, go to the priests in the churches, the Pope in the Vatican. They are not alive – they are so afraid of life, so afraid of nature that they have suppressed it from everywhere. They are already in their graves. You can paint the grave, you can even make a marble grave, very valuable – but the man inside is dead.

He is talking about Christian monasticism. Now, it still may not be an accurate statement, but nevertheless, the origin of the statement is in the context of a discussion of Chang Tzu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 at 10:36 AM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Greg said:

In fairness, it is not entirely clear how grahika and grahya could be nondual and yet cittasantanas are still multiple in some sense. One can also see how East Asian stuff like rocks and mountains having Buddha nature arose - if grahika and grahya are nondual how could they not?

Malcolm wrote:

Cittasantanas are real. Subject and object are not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

KeithBC said:

The traditional protection against such things is adherence to a traditional lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

Virtually all of the sexual misconduct I have heard about is in traditional lineages with traditional teachers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

Caz said:

With respect to Lama Phabonkhapa it would be fairly foolish to consider him sectarian when he incorporated the the Vajrayogini practice from the Sakya system.

Malcolm wrote:

It is proper to consider him sectarian based on the numerous grossly sectarian comments scattered in his collected works.

M

Caz said:

And yet when he taught he taught to all regardless of sect. But lets not get into the business of dragging Lama's names through the mud. Sectarianism to combat Sectarianism is still Sectarianism.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, it is called "making converts".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

viniketa said:

My point is that the ālayavijñāna seems to speak to 'dual existence' (in saṃsāra), while the vimuktikāyo is said to be dvidhādauṣṭhulyahānitaḥ, sa evānāśravo dhātur acintyaḥ kuśalo dhruvaḥ.

My understanding is that the ālayavijñāna contains bīja, vāsanā (karmic 'impressions') which provide 'initial conditions' for a continuum. But I do not find in the literature that those vāsanā, if bīja are 'nullified', have any effect on the process of āśrayasyaparāvṛtti, 'return to the basis'.

This is what I am finding confusing.

Malcolm wrote:

The transformation of the basis is the conversion of vijñāna to jñāna based on the eradication of the bijas.

The Mahāyāna saṃgraha contains a complete account.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

No offense taken. I think you will find the terms/experiences that I am describing are part of many paths.

Malcolm wrote:

There are experiences in the Dzogchen path that are shared. There are experiences in the Dzogchen path that are unique to that path. Rainbow body comes from the latter experiences, and not the former.

Jeff said:

That may well be true. Those are the differences that I have looking for.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, then, you need to find a Dzogchen master in whom you have faith, receive transmission and do whatever he or she says.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

viniketa said:

Thank you again, Joyti, for your reply.

I'm attempting to follow this discussion, so would like to back-up a bit...

malcolm said:

Correct, the Yogacara schools asserts an essence. This is why the Madhyamakas refer to them as "vastuvadins" i.e. realists. In other words, they are non-dualists because all phenomena of skandhas, dhātus and ayatanas are mind only. They are realists because they propose the existence of individual continuums.

viniketa said:

To which "Madhyamakas" does this refer, specifically?

Malcolm wrote:

All Indian Madhyamaka.

viniketa said:

Also, the "individual continuums", I assume, are ālayavijñāna?

Thanks in advance.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we can know this is so because Asanga, defending on the concept of ālayavijñāna asserts that it is the same thing as what is referred to in the "Nikaya" schools as the bhavaṅga-citta, the so called re-linking consciousness.

viniketa said:

Where, in Yogācāra literature, is the connection between ālayavijñāna and āśrayasya parāvṛttir?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna Saṃgraha, Trimsika, Yogacarabhūmi, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

Actually I'm referring to your statement about dzogchen "The basis described in Dzogchen has no essence, is not established in anyway, being originally pure. In other word, the basis in Dzogchen is kadag, emptiness free from all extremes. " Your argument just point back to your own statement rendering it as of duality.

You also criticize proponents of yogacara as realists and advice me to read which I did, but I don't see any, mind to provide the reason why you think it is falling on the side of existence?

Malcolm wrote:

All statements made are necessarily confined to language, all language is dualistic. If you wish to be in the realm of non-duality, then don't say anything.

You need to read more thoroughly and carefully.

But frankly, I don't see much point in continuing this conversation, since you are not here to learn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

No offense taken. I think you will find the terms/experiences that I am describing are part of many paths.

Malcolm wrote:

There are experiences in the Dzogchen path that are shared. There are experiences in the Dzogchen path that are unique to that path. Rainbow body comes from the latter experiences, and not the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

According to your logic, then the need to mention 'free from all extremes' mean such a doctrine is of 'duality, not free from extremes', then that would apply to your own view of dzogchen as well.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I never said that doctrine of Advaita was dualistic, merely that it fell on the side of existence. Likewise, Yogacara is a non-dual teaching, but it too falls on the side of existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Tsong Khapa, form realm shamatha and emptiness

Content:

Virgo said:

Just so you know, in Theravada, vipassana refers to actual moments of penetrative insight, not to techniques that may or may not bring vipassana about. Concentration is present with every arisen citta, so vipassana, including all stages of it, is possible at any moment. This is why non-meditators and even some who were not exactly upstanding citizens gained insight (became aryas) while listening to an explanation by Buddha, etc. For some people shamatha might be an aid because if done correctly it is kusala, or wholesome, and all kusala is an aid in wisdom.

Kevin

Tom said:

I am only slightly familiar with the Pāli tradition, however, I find the relationship between vipassana and Kuśāla and the semantic differences between Kuśāla and Puñña to be quite a fascinating topic. I think that understanding the difference between Kuśāla and Puñña sheds light on the roles of samatha and vipassana but that is a little controversial and takes us down a different rabbit hole ... anyways gotta run ...

Jnana said:

According to the Pāli Abhidhamma every skillful mind (kusala citta) includes both samatha & vipassanā.

Malcolm wrote:

Kusala is better translated as "positive".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The basis described in Dzogchen has no essence, is not established in anyway, being originally pure. In other word, the basis in Dzogchen is kadag, emptiness free from all extremes.

Jyoti said:

What is this kadag (emptiness) then, if an essence is nondual, there is no need to say 'free from all extremes'.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a need, precisely because Advaitan non-duality is not free from extremes, it is the extreme of existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Yes, many Gelug teachers are trying to make peace with this. No one can deny what is there in black and white in his collected works, and not just one volume. Malcolm can direct you to where to find it. (He sent the stuff to me and as my Tibetan improved I forced myself to read it).

In fact, I thank Malcolm for opening my eyes in this way because it caused me a lot of soul searching and helped me find my own way of coping in the very traditional Tibetan Buddhist settings in which I work and live. (Well, it was one of several factors but much appreciated).

History has so many lessons to teach us. Some of them are painful.

Malcolm, I am sure... And I would think you are probably right that it was Ngulchu Dharmabhadra's commentary. Do you think that most of the Sakya lamas would be willing to give someone like me an initiation, who has had it previously in Gelug? It would be nice to be able to take a broader range of teachings on it.

I would love to know what the things Phabongkhapa instituted are, but I am betting they are too detailed for discussion on a general forum.

Malcolm wrote:

Any Sakya lama would happily give you the dbang lung and khri of the Naro Khacho system.

Major changes Pabhongkha made was tossing out the introduction to Dharmata; and he made the Guru yoga section very complicated in a completely unnecessary way, he added offerings and so on that are not needed, etc. In other words, he tried to bring the sadhana into line with Gelug expectations of a Cakrasamvara sadhana.

Actually, one of the most important commentaries in Sakya on Naro Khacho was written by a Gelug disciple of Khyentse Wangpo.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to start providing citations -- and not just your so called "logic".

I don't care if someone is a Buddhist or a Hindu or whatever, but it pains me to see anyone so thoroughly misrepresent both traditions as you are doing here.

Jyoti said:

The mahayana scriptures don't specially mentioned this topic but the dzogchen scriptures and commentaries does provide some clues, with concept such as 'phenomena is mere appearance without an essence', the concept of 'existence of samantabhadra as unique', etc. I'm sure you don't need me to provide citation for these.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are going to assert that the intention of Dzogchen and Advaita are the same, then you need to provide side by side citations.

There is no point of course, because, for example, the Rig pa rang shar specifically refutes Advaita, naming Shankaracarya by name in the 25th chapter.

So what I am telling you is that even if you try to present citations from both Advaita and Dzogchen to try and illustrate their commonality, it will be easy to show how you are mistaken.

Sadly, many people make the same mistake you are making and come up with a system that is called "ra ma lug" in Tibetan i.e. a system that is neither a goat nor a sheep. How do they do this? By relying on their own intellectual contrivances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Even one Sakya lama praised some of the Gelug commentaries on VY but asked that this not be broadcast too widely!

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakya commentaries written Dharmabhadra and Thugkwan are fine in that they do not depart at all from the earlier Sakya commentaries. Pabhongakha instituted some novelties in his presentation of the system that earned some criticism by the present head of Sakya. It is for this reason that if you want to hear the Vajrayogini teachings from a Sakya Lama you must receive the empowerment from a Sakya lama.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Why follow one tradition of Buddhism?

Content:

Caz said:

With respect to Lama Phabonkhapa it would be fairly foolish to consider him sectarian when he incorporated the the Vajrayogini practice from the Sakya system.

Malcolm wrote:

It is proper to consider him sectarian based on the numerous grossly sectarian comments scattered in his collected works.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

there is no contradiction to the advaita vedanta and dzogchen perspective of the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there are differences: deep and important differences. Only someone ignorant of the details of both with make such a ridiculous claim.

Jyoti said:

The basis (body) has no details more than what is describe here, only the means are much difference with the three but we are not talking about the means here.

Malcolm wrote:

Brahman, the basis if you will, of Advaita Vendanta, is described as sat, cit, ananda -- being, conciousness and bliss. It is truly existent, unproduced, unchanged over time, etc.

The basis described in Dzogchen has no essence, is not established in anyway, being originally pure. In other word, the basis in Dzogchen is kadag, emptiness free from all extremes.

You see, you are misrepresenting both traditions by claiming they have the same meaning.

This is not a difference in means, this is a difference in fundamental view.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

The body is similar but the means is different.

viniketa said:

Thank you for the answer, Jyoti. Are you saying that Advaita Vedānta is a further implementation of Yogācāra?

Jyoti said:

No. Yogacara did not specifically say anything about the root consciouness being a singularity or plural, neither did any scriptures of the mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to start providing citations -- and not just your so called "logic".

I don't care if someone is a Buddhist or a Hindu or whatever, but it pains me to see anyone so thoroughly misrepresent both traditions as you are doing here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

there is no contradiction to the advaita vedanta and dzogchen perspective of the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there are differences: deep and important differences. Only someone ignorant of the details of both with make such a ridiculous claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Jyoti said:

The root consciousness itself cannot be shared.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, that is why each individual sentient being possesses their own unique, unshared mulavijñāna.

Each sentient being possess the eight consciousness separately which are merely different names for the operations of vijñāna. It is similar with prāṇa vāyu -- the main vāyu functioning in the body is prāṇa; but it takes different names based on its action.

Likewise, each sentient being possess a vijñāna skandha: when it is described from the point of view of possessing traces, it is called the ālaya or mūlavijñāna; when it function through the six senses, it is called the six sense consciousness; when it incorrectly grasps a self it is called the kliṣṭamano-vijñāna, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Yudron said:

I'm not a scholar or translator, but I do feel that rigpa (vidya Skt) does not mean knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa, in all Dzogchen texts, is contrasted with Ma rigpa. Because of not knowing [ma rig pa] our real state we enter samsara. Through knowing [rig pa] our real state, we attain liberation.

M

Yudron said:

Of course we don't disagree -- it's just the word knowing IMHO is not the best because it implies a thought.

Malcolm wrote:

Thought is not a problem for one who has rigpa. It is only a problem for those who do not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

What happens in a Dzogchen master's transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

Not what you describe.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:10 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna, one or separate?

Content:

Jyoti said:

If it does, then beings are not mere appearance but possessing real essence.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the Yogacara schools asserts an essence. This is why the Madhyamakas refer to them as "vastuvadins" i.e. realists. In other words, they are non-dualists because all phenomena of skandhas, dhātus and ayatanas are mind only. They are realists because they propose the existence of individual continuums.

Jyoti said:

And we have the problem of shared consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. This is why you need to read what Yogacara authors like Asanga actually say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: The latest academic thought on Dzog Chen and Mahayoga

Content:

conebeckham said:

Anything is possible when you're talking about Tibetan Hagiographies. In particular, writers have agendas--even academics have agendas, much less adherents and promulgators of various lineages.

But in the end, Naropa is a source of great blessings, and he is known widely as the "synthesizer" (or compiler, if you like) of the most famous Tibetan Tantrayana Completion Stage system known to the wide world, and is important not merely for the Kagyupas--as well as being the source of Sakyapas Vajrayogini. He is hardly "over-rated," regardless.

Malcolm wrote:

I think there is also a little competition happening here --because the Naro Khacho teachings in Sakya are always billed as "The teaching so special even Marpa didn't get it".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Male and female

Content:

Virgo said:

Is there Buddhist and/or medical reasons why children are born either male or female? What causes birth as a particular sex? Are people always born as one or the other successively over lifetimes or does it change?

Thanks for any responses.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

There are reasons connected with karma and with biology. Tibetan Medicine emphasizes the biological aspect more. If semen is more profuse, it will be a boy. If the

ovum is more profuse then it will be a girl. If both are in equal portion, then the child will be homosexual or intersexed.

M

JinpaRangdrol said:

I have never heard homosexuality as a result of equal virility of the essences. Only intersexuality. But it makes total sense! Is there a source where I can find more on the correlation? As a gay man, I'd be very interested to read more about TTM's explanation for sexual orientation.

Thanks so much!

JR

Malcolm wrote:

It is briefly explained in the chapter on conception in the explanatory tantra of the four medicine tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: The latest acadmenic thought on Dzog Chen and Mahayoga

Content:

Stewart said:

Elaborate on this please, I have never heard that Marpa never met Naropa.

Malcolm wrote:

In Sakya sources, it is reported that Milarepa himself never reported that Marpa had met Naropa in person. Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen expresses the opinion therefore, that Marpa indeed never met Naropa in person. Jetsun Rinpoche was born mid 12th century. The standard dates for Mila are 1052-1135.

Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen lived 1147-1216. He was teaching the Hevajra tantra by the time he was eleven. He had received Kagyu teachings from minor lineage holder from Marpa.

So the Sakyas have always maintained that Marpa never met Naropa in person, that he was a disciple only of Maitripa in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

Agreed. But, those are really not examples of what I meant by a "guru connection".

Malcolm wrote:
Then be more precise.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 5:50 AM
Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

There are broad commonalities in Dzogchen with common Mahāyāna view; commonalities with Vajrayāna as well; but the perspective of Dzogchen about the basis in terms of what is called sound, lights, and rays is unique to Dzogchen and not shared with other traditions -- though it is tempting to try and find connections.

M

Jeff said:
OK, one last question...

When you read the following statement...

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 179-182). Kindle Edition.

But such a being may manifest a body through which others can have the possibility of being helped. The Body of Light, or the Light Body of a being who has realized the Great Transfer, are both phenomena which can be actively maintained so that those having the visionary clarity necessary for perceiving them can communicate with the fully realized individuals whose bodies find themselves in a dimension of pure light.

... You do not think this communication is the same/similar as what is experienced between a Guru and an advanced student?

Malcolm wrote:
Depends on the tradition, the guru, and the student.

Receiving shaktipat from a Kundalini guru, for example, or satsang with an Advaita, etc., or Dokusan from a Zenmaster has nothing at all to do with a direct introduction from a Dzogchen master. They are not even in the same ballpark. Different principles, different practices, different experiences, different results.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

As stated previously, I was just attempting to point out what I believe to be universal components.

Malcolm wrote:

There are broad commonalities in Dzogchen with common Mahāyāna view; commonalities with Vajrayāna as well; but the perspective of Dzogchen about the basis in terms of what is called sound, lights, and rays is unique to Dzogchen and not shared with other traditions -- though it is tempting to try and find connections.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Yudron said:

I'm not a scholar or translator, but I do feel that rigpa (vidya Skt) does not mean knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa, in all Dzogchen texts, is contrasted with Ma rigpa. Because of not knowing [ma rig pa] our real state we enter samsara. Through knowing [rig pa] our real state, we attain liberation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

My point is that different paths describe similar things with different words. This is often because the various perspectives driven by the time and culture.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case you would be mistaken since you know next to nothing about Dzogchen.

Jeff said:

Making the 5 elements of your body dissolve into light can be "translated to" Ascending into heaven.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it can't. It has nothing to do with going to heaven, or anything like that.

Jeff said:

I will stop. You continue to miss my point. I am not trying to define that there is a "heaven". Only that to an educated person, seeing a body dissolve into light could be described as "ascending into heaven".

Malcolm wrote:

And you continue to miss mine i.e. you actually don't understand what is being discussed here in the Dzogchen forum, whatever else you may properly understand elsewhere.

And as to your point, you won't see anyone actually dissolving into light. At most, you would observe a shrinkage of the physical remains of a person.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

ngodrup said:

Dudjom Rinpoche, Jigdral Yeshe Dorje said this quite clearly in his Dzogchen View of Ngondro.

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, Ngondro *is* the practice of Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Rinpoche, Namkhai Norbu, says this very clearly in every retreat. If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, Guru Yoga is the practice of Dzogchen.

They are saying the same thing -- way of proceeding is a little different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

My "Bet" is that if you were in the presence of someone who had attained Rigpa you would "feel" an overwhelming sense of "peace" (if you were not yet able to connect as Chogyal Namkhai Norbu describes).

Malcolm wrote:

You would lose that bet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

My point is that different paths describe similar things with different words. This is often because the various perspectives driven by the time and culture.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case you would be mistaken since you know next to nothing about Dzogchen.

Jeff said:

Making the 5 elements of your body dissolve into light can be "translated to" Ascending into heaven.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it can't. It has nothing to do with going to heaven, or anything like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

I fail to see the point of the above comment other than to politely say that I don't know what I am talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

When it comes to Dzogchen, yes, you have no idea what you are talking about.

If you are interested in Dzogchen, you should connect with a Dzogchen master.

Saying that there is one truth and different paths is meaningless in this context. Without connecting with the transmission of Dzogchen, and applying it in your life you will never understand what Dzogchen is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 21st, 2012 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

Thank you for your words. I believe the above is exactly what I have said in this thread and in the "Guru Yoga" thread. I have just attempted to describe it in experiential (and simple) terms.

I will also check out your book recommendation.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not something that you arrive to on your own. It depends on transmission from a qualified master.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

Could you describe how it would be different? Does not a senior student feel light/divine love in the presence of someone who has attained Rigpa? (Divine love "feels" more like a combination of "peace" and "joy" than what we normally describe as romantic love.)

Malcolm wrote:

No. Not at all. There is no "vibration" that you will feel emanating from someone who has genuine knowledge of the state of Dzogchen.

I suggest you read Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, and become a little more educated about this subject.

I cannot educate you from the ground up. However, I can supply you with a couple of citations:

When a master teaches Dzogchen, he or she is trying to transmit a state of knowledge. The aim of the master is to awaken the student, opening that individual's consciousness to the primordial state. The master will not say, "Follow my rules and

obey my precepts!" He will say, "Open your inner eye and observe yourself. Stop seeking an external lamp to enlighten you from outside, but light your own inner lamp. Thus the teachings will come to live in you, and you in the teachings."

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 179-182). Kindle Edition.

Ordinary beings are reborn without choice, conditioned by their karma into taking a body according to the causes they have accumulated over countless past lives. A totally realized being, on the other hand, is free from the cycle of conditioned cause and effect. But such a being may manifest a body through which others can have the possibility of being helped. The Body of Light, or the Light Body of a being who has realized the Great Transfer, are both phenomena which can be actively maintained so that those having the visionary clarity necessary for perceiving them can communicate with the fully realized individuals whose bodies find themselves in a dimension of pure light.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. The Crystal and the Way of Light: Sutra, Tantra and Dzogchen (pp. 162-163). Kindle Edition.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

In Dzogchen, is not the rainbow body something noticed/seen by another? One "reaches the point" where the radiating of light can be "seen". In Dzogchen, I had thought this was part of attaining Rigpa. (But, I apologize in advance, my specific knowledge of Dzogchen and terms is very limited.)

Malcolm wrote:

Ordinary people cannot perceive rainbow body.

It is called "rainbow body" because the five elements revert to their original nature as the five wisdom lights. But this light is not photons -- it is called "light" but it is not physical light.

M

Jeff said:

Agreed. That is why I put words like "seen" in quotes.

Seeing is a product (or conversion) of the mind. It would be better to say that it can be "felt" by one with an open heart. In other transitions it is described as "an outpouring of divine love".

Malcolm wrote:

Rainbow body, or the body of light is something very precise in Dzogchen teachings. It is not something felt by people with open hearts, etc.

It is a very specific result of a very specific type of practice called tögal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

In Dzogchen, is not the rainbow body something noticed/seen by another? One "reaches the point" where the radiating of light can be "seen". In Dzogchen, I had thought this was part of attaining Rigpa. (But, I apologize in advance, my specific knowledge of Dzogchen and terms is very limited.)

Malcolm wrote:

Ordinary people cannot perceive rainbow body.

It is called "rainbow body" because the five elements revert to their original nature as the five wisdom lights. But this light is not photons -- it is called "light" but it is not physical light.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Jyoti said:

If one witness from a subjective angle, a being other than the witness is awakened, his awakening is of appearance only in term of the witness. It does not affect the purification of the witness's own alaya. On the other hand, if one witness one's own awakening, it does not affect the karma of other beings, since other beings were of mere appearance without an actual basis that is connected to one's own state.

Malcolm wrote:

You still have not solved the problem. You are speaking about this being and that being as independent continuums. This is only possible if each being's ālayavijñāna is separate,

etc (which is of course the actual position of the yogacara school).

You just keep chewing away at this logically, and you will arrive at the position of Asanga and Vasubandhu -- or you could simply do yourself a favor and actually read what they say. Start with the Mahāyāna Saṃgraha.

Ok, I am finished with this conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Atomic/Rainbow Body

Content:

Jeff said:

They are both just different terms to describe the high level development of the energy/light body. With an "energy" approach, the feeling refines from periodic heat/vibrations in parts of the body, to the full body, to full 24/7, then to the full body at a cellular level (atomic). With a "meditation" approach, often one does not notice the energy until it starts "radiating" beyond the body and at that point, it is already so "refined" that it "feels" like light.

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing to do with Dzogchen teaching on rainbow body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The fault of this reasoning of course is that when one sentient being purifies the mulavijñāna, then all would be liberated.

M

Jyoti said:

Karma persist for beings with ignorance, but these are not view as impure by oneself who were awakened.

Malcolm wrote:

If this theoretical single mulavijñāna is purified, there is no possibility of ignorance for anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Beings and consciousnesses, one or many?

Content:

Jyoti said:

by Malcolm » Mon Aug 20, 2012 12:06 pm

Jyoti wrote:

Just as within a dream, appearances of people seems to have their own individual mind streams, but they are not real, only deceptively exist as appearance only. What make a dream environment possible is not due to multiple consciousnesses, but the consciousness of your own which is not share by anyone else. Similary in reality, all phenomena is manifestation of a single consciousness.

Malcolm:

This is Vedanta.

Jyoti:

This is not a problem on the position of definitive meaning.

Malcolm

Yes, it most certainly is. Moreover, since you are a fan of Yogacara, you should be aware that while Vasubandhu, for example, rejects outer objects, he defends the existence of sentient beings possessing distinct and unique mental continuums.

In other words, yogacara does not propose that the appearance of other minds is illusory -- in fact, when you read the Mahāyāna Samgraha, for example, by Asanga, he shows quite clearly that it is because of shared traces that we all perceive the same container world. In other words, for Yogacara, individual minds are real, but not their appearances.

I think you need to correct your understanding of Yogacara.

BTW, this is off topic for this thread, you should continue this in either the academic forum or somewhere else, but not in this thread.

M

I can merely discuss the matter itself based on my own understanding on the topics.

1. "for example, rejects outer objects, he defends the existence of sentient beings possessing distinct and unique mental continuums".

The alaya-vijnana stored the mental traces of others as well as those of our own, in other words, beings are not really exist outside of this single root consciousness.

2. "for example, by Asanga, he shows quite clearly that it is because of shared traces

that we all perceive the same container world. In other words, for Yogacara, individual minds are real, but not their appearances. "

Being the content (traces) of the singular consciousness, of course these traces were shared, otherwise there is no means nor basis for such sharing to occur. The individual minds are real as one's own since both are equal as being contained within a single consciousness.

jyoti

Malcolm wrote:

The fault of this reasoning of course is that when one sentient being purifies the mulavijñāna, then all would be liberated.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 12:06 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Jyoti said:

Just as within a dream, appearances of people seem to have their own individual mind streams, but they are not real, only deceptively exist as appearance only. What makes a dream environment possible is not due to multiple consciousnesses, but the consciousness of your own which is not shared by anyone else. Similarly in reality, all phenomena is manifestation of a single consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

This is Vedānta.

Jyoti said:

This is not a problem on the position of definitive meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it most certainly is. Moreover, since you are a fan of Yogacara, you should be aware that while Vasubandhu, for example, rejects outer objects, he defends the existence of sentient beings possessing distinct and unique mental continuums.

In other words, Yogacara does not propose that the appearance of other minds is illusory -- in fact, when you read the Mahāyāna Saṃgraha, for example, by Asaṅga, he shows quite clearly that it is because of shared traces that we all perceive the same container world. In other words, for Yogacara, individual minds are real, but not their appearances.

I think you need to correct your understanding of Yogacara.

BTW, this is off topic for this thread, you should continue this in either the academic forum or somewhere else, but not in this thread.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

humanpreta said:

Is the nirmanakaya buddhafield in one of samsara's realm? i.e.: formless.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not a formless realm and no it is not part of samsara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

sorry i keep asking these repetitive questions.

just tryna get a good understanding.

thanks for the clarification.

peace

Malcolm wrote:

No worries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Tönpa Shenrab Miwoche is from a 14th century terma?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

By the way, if anyone thinks I am undermining Bon, Sam van Schaik does a similar treatment on Guru Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

The earliest formal accounts of Tonpa Shenrab as a Buddha are from the Mdo 'dus and the Zer mig which both are termas revealed in the 11th century. However, there were 18 Bonpo Tertons before Shenchén Lugah.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Mandala Offering in Ngondro

Content:

Sopa Yutso said:

Thank you, now it is all clear...

Malcolm wrote:

The universe has not yet been put up for sale, so it is still without an owner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

OK. That's the vernacular, but you mentioned 'all samayas'. In DI the samaya encompasses all others, so presumably breaking it also breaks all others?

In terms of the Ngagpa, is it correct to assume they all practice Dzogchen, or do the Gelug Ngagpas not do so? (I was told there was a Gelug Ngagpa ordination, but I've not managed to confirm this.)

Malcolm wrote:

The term sngags pa is pretty general and loose.

The probable early origin of it had to do with the fact that serious Buddhist upasakas in India typically wore white. This custom was transferred to Tibet. Because in Tibet there was no context of a wider Buddhist society, upasaka mantra practitioners came to be respected along with the monks. It was never the case that in India there was a so called "sngags pa" sangha. The sngags pa class of practitioners evolved from the circumstances of Tibetan society. So, your so called sngags pa was originally a Buddhist upasaka who practiced tantra.

Later on when the Chö tradition was evolving, alongside of this there evolved a kind of Buddhist sadhu in Tibet called a chöpa. The present day hair empowerment tradition largely is derived from chö.

These days there are many people who are told by their teachers to where stripped robes, etc., and they call themselves Ngagpas too. Also the garb of different sngag pa colleges vary -- there really isn't a set thing.

There is no sngags pa tradition in Gelug. It exists only in Nyingma. The only Ngagpas in Sakya are the Khon, and their tradition is Nyingma as well. The Kagyus don't really have ngagpas in the same way as the Nyingmapas. They have Togdens and Repas (also another kind of Buddhist sadhu). In general, the term Ngagpa has come to mean "serious tantric practitioner who is not a monk", much like its original usage. The idea that ngagpas have to follow monastic vows is a very debatable point of view --but it comes from the approach to the nine yānas found in root Anuyoga tantra, Dupa'i Do.

ChNN does not emphasize a chatechistic approach to samaya where you are behaving like a hinayāna practitioner, obsessed with the details of one's vows.

Samaya means "being together". So in this case it refers to your relationship with the teachings, teacher, fellow students, and ultimately all beings. If you treat other people like shit, if you are rude to them without cause, etc., then you have made mistake. Also we often do not understand when we have broken a samaya so it is pointless to obsess about the vows. There are hundreds and thousands of samayas. So, we just do Guru yoga.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, you still receive all samayas. There is no "samaya" free transmission.

Blue Garuda said:

Is there a brief definition of 'samaya' which applies here?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that you keep good relations with your teacher and fellow students, and you don't blab about secret practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

need help clarifying with the term infinite potentiality and the symbol of the mirror.

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

The term "infinite potentiality" refers to the primordial state's capacity to allow any form at all to appear within it.

The mirror means your primordial state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

SSJ3Gogeta said:

I'm talking about someone who just receives straight up Direct Introduction ala ChNN.

I'm pretty sure such people have sex with non-practitioners.

So would this be allowed?

Malcolm wrote:

Right, you still receive all samayas. There is no "samaya" free transmission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

xabir said:

'Thusness' asked me not to talk openly about his realizations in terms of bhumi (not that he rejects such maps). It is not good to tell people 'I am such and such bhumi' (it often carries lots of baggage) but it is ok to discuss one's experience/realization as it is.

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Its funny that 'Thusness' thinks he is on any bhumi at all.

Atleast Adyashanti has a Zen lineage. 'Thusness' is just a fraud.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think we really need to be discussing this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 20th, 2012 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Jyoti said:

Just as within a dream, appearances of people seems to have their own individual mind streams, but they are not real, only deceptively exist as appearance only. What make a dream environment possible is not due to multiple consciousnesses, but the consciousness of your own which is not share by anyone else. Similary in reality, all phenomena is manifestation of a single consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

This is Vedanta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Also receiving direct introduction is connected with samaya.

SSJ3Gogeta said:

yes but only one, as opposed to 14 root and 8 branch samayas.

Malcolm wrote:

No, also these other samayas applys.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone who recieves an anuttarayogatantra empowerment already has the 14 root and 8 branch samayas.

M

SSJ3Gogeta said:

Then its best not to take such empowerments, and just get Direct Introduction?

I know I'm changing the subject.

Malcolm wrote:

Also receiving direct introduction is connected with samaya. But if you are a ChNN student, you just worry about how he teaches it and don't worry about the rest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

byamspa said:

shrug. I was told to wear mine in practice situations, so I try to do that as practical. If yours was causing problems, I can see that it would be just as practical to put it aside too.

It might slightly dharma-psycho-somatic or something, but I think it helps me focus on what I'm doing when I wear it.

Malcolm wrote:

I merely keep my hair long. You would just think I was some hippy. I don't wear any religion clothing of any kind. It is not necessary for me.

byamspa said:

we all do what we gotta do. I have my instructions that I follow to the best of my ability.
.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. Sometimes if it is cold, I might use a blanket. Then I kind of look like a fat blond guy wearing a native blanket.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

There are two suttas that describe nibbana as consciousness (vinnana) eternal (anantam) and everywhere (sabbato) aka omnipresent. And another that also calls it eternal (dhuvam). So it's hardly sketchy to refer to Nibbana as eternal. You yourself previously pointed out the dharmakaya is eternal as in the Mahayana Parinirvana Sutra. This has nothing to do with the Pudgala theory. There is simply a distinction being made between the conditioned vs. the unconditioned consciousnesses. Underlying everything is consciousness, meaning, it is the final analytic. And it is already beyond existence and non-, per the analysis of the 12-links. So I think Garchen Rinpoche and Jeff are right; it is due to the nature of consciousness being all-pervasive that Guru Yoga can have its effect.

Malcolm wrote:

Any consciousness by which one describing the Tathagata would describe him: That the Tathagata has abandoned, its root destroyed, made like a palmyra stump, deprived of the conditions of development, not destined for future arising. Freed from the classification of consciousness, Vaccha, the Tathagata is deep, boundless, hard to fathom, like the sea."

<http://www.accesstinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.072.than.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

For the supported there is instability, for the unsupported there is no instability; when there is no instability there is serenity; when there is serenity there is no inclination: when there is no inclination there is no coming-and-going; when there is no coming-and-going there is no deacease-and-uprising; when there is no deacease-and-uprising there is neither "here" nor "beyond" nor "in between the two." Just this is the end of suffering.

<http://www.accesstinsight.org/tipitaka/kn/ud/ud.8.04.irel.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

There is, bhikkhus, that base where there is no earth, no water, no fire, no air; no base consisting of the infinity of space, no base consisting of the infinity of consciousness, no base consisting of nothingness, no base consisting of neither-perception-nor-non-perception; neither this world nor another world nor both; neither sun nor moon. Here, bhikkhus, I say there is no coming, no going, no staying, no deceasing, no uprising. Not fixed, not movable, it has no support. Just this is the end of suffering.

<http://www.accesstinsight.org/tipitaka/kn/ud/ud.8.01.irel.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

byamspa said:

shrug. I was told to wear mine in practice situations, so i try to do that as practical. If yours was causing problems, I can see that it would be just as practical to put it aside too.

It might slightly dharma-psycho-somatic or something, but i think it helps me focus on what im doing when i wear it.

Malcolm wrote:

I merely keep my hair long. You would just think I was some hippy. I don't wear any religion clothing of any kind. It is not necessary for me.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:43 PM
Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?
Content:

heart said:
Yes, sure. You know any such community?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
I don't mean like place with a gate and land, I mean a society of practitioners who live near each other.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:26 PM
Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
A real sngags pa (mantrika) is someone whose mantras actually work.

As such, they are the Tibetan equivalent of brahmins, and often belong to family lineages. Like traditional brahmins they wear white, have long hair, are married and are responsible for the ritual life of their communities.

heart said:
Yes, indeed. My Guru also said several times said that we should be able to show "some result from our practice" if we dress like that. Even though I am a Ngakpa I have doubts about what Ngakpas could or should be here in the west. The picture you paint here Malcolm would certainly only work in a Buddhist society.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Well, within a community of practitioners it would work just fine.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:15 PM
Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?
Content:
ngodrup said:

Seems there's another category, the ngakpa who is ordained as such. At least this exists in the Nyingma.

I think it's going to be a case by case analysis when talking about ngakpas who also happen to be western-- just the same as it is with those ngakpas from traditionally Buddhist countries. On top of that there are various lineages of ngakpas and their style of practice varies.

Quite a few are practitioners of Dudjom Tersar, or Longchen Nyingtik, or Chang Ter; but then there are dratsangs that practice several lineages and follow distinct traditions.

heart said:

It isn't actually an ordination, like the ordination to become a monk/nun, it is an empowerment. You can call it an elaborate Samaya if you like.

/magnus

Blue Garuda said:

There is often formal ordination based on tantric samayas.

Malcolm wrote:

Sort of -- this is a kind of a Ngagpa by fiat sort of thing. It has nothing to do with a real sngags pa empowerment which is called a skra dbang, a hair empowerment.

If you are a real sngags pa then you receive the hair empowerment; and the most common tradition these days is Dudjom Tersar.

In point of fact that hair empowerment is intimately connected with the uncontrived conduct of a Dzogchen practitioner.

Everyone who receives an anuttarayogatantra empowerment already has the 14 root and 8 branch samayas. Receiving them again in a special ceremony along with a Zentra is just sort of a formality.

Actually, each item of Ngagpa "gear" has very profound meaning and points to a realization possessed or aspired to.

And finally, one's hair is empowered as a mandala of dakinis, so it can never be cut or trimmed -- because to do so would invite a punishment by dakinis for destroying their home.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Who is ngagpa?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A real sngags pa (mantrika) is someone whose mantras actually work.

As such, they are the Tibetan equivalent of brahmins, and often belong to family lineages. Like traditional brahmins they wear white, have long hair, are married and are responsible for the ritual life of their communities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

He is citing a parallel with Buddha's discourses, not a distinction.

Malcolm wrote:

A parallel, yes, but with a distinction. You are overlooking the distinctions.

deepbluehum said:

Sure, there's a small distinction being made in context. The Buddha never asserts an unchanging individual atman; that's obvious. That's not what's important. What's important is that he never specifically refutes Upanishadic notions. That's number one. Number two, he does assert nibbana as an being eternal consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Buddha never says that. This is why there is so much discussion about it among various schools. He never comes right out and says, anywhere at all that "Nirvana is an eternal consciousness". This is the reason why, for example, the Sautrantikas can say that nirvana is a non-existence, etc. Why? Because they reject the speculations of the Abhidharmikas, and based themselves strictly on what the sutras say. Since the Śravaka sutras do not say explicitly this, we then have divergent schools of thought arising about what the Buddha meant.

deepbluehum said:

There's no getting around that. Number three, even if you assert an unchanging atman, if you assert a changing atman superimposed on the unchanging one, and the unchanging one merges into Brahman when the changing one ceases, then you have, in sum and in function, an identical theory with Buddhist liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you beleive in your first assertion.

deepbluehum said:

You would have what would amount to a distinction without a difference. This is what I've been pointing at in these recent threads, that all the profusions of Buddhist diatribe amounts to endless distinctions without a functional difference. And that is why you have the functionality of Guru Yoga which functions almost identically to the same procedure in Hindu tantric systems.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if your intitial premise is true. However, your initial premise is an gross overstatement not grounded in fact; rather it is grounded in a sketchy interpretation of one statement in the Tripitika. It is similar to the Pudgalavadins who try to prove, based on one or two statements, that Buddha taught the existence of an inexpressible person [pudgala] who is neither the same as nor different than the aggregates who nevertheless transmigrates.

Like their position, there is not sufficient evidence to support your present claim. It is definitely not sufficient for making argument about principles of Guru Yoga. Guru Yoga is simply a method of recognizing and abiding in the nature of the reality that your Guru introduces and nothing more.

On another note, it certainly would be nice if everyone was in a state of ekacitta -- then all these pointless conversations would cease.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 11:14 AM

Title: Re: Tönpa Shenrab Miwoche is from a 14th century terma?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/96594534/Bellezza-Shenrab> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

[

He is citing a parallell with Buddha's discourses, not a distinction.

Malcolm wrote:

A parallel, yes, but with a distinction. You are overlooking the distinctions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Sometimes you have to let things stand. The passage means what it says.

Malcolm wrote:

You have misread -- see pg. 94, section 6.9:

"...though it is clearly seen as not having any metaphysical self/ ātman as an underlying support, as does the transmigrating ātman"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I think it's more correct to say that the basis in gzhan stong (Shentong) is "Buddha Nature," which is not EXACTLY equivalent with emptiness, at least according to Dolpopa's presentation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is exactly emptiness precisely in the fashion that I described it, even in Dolbuwa's presentation.

conebeckham said:

I think there's a subtle point here. Shentong does say Buddha Nature is "Emptiness," but also discusses a basis beyond conceptual mind. This is from the POV of post-equipoise dialectics, though--I agree that the meditation is the same. "Prasangikas," that Tibetan invention, do not discuss a "basis" at all.

Yes?

Malcolm wrote:

No, they do discuss a basis. That basis is emptiness.

"Where emptiness is possible...", etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The Upanishads were not in full bloom then. Even in Upanishadic tradition, the atman is not seen as unchanging. Harvey and Werner recognized this when commenting that Buddha was not rejecting Upanishadic notions. There is a definite symbiosis going on here.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chandogya, which defines Atman as permanent and unchanging, predates the Buddha by three or four hundred years, as does the Brihadarayanaka.

deepbluehum said:

As Harvey notes from Werner's analysis, the Buddha is only refuting an unchanging personality structure that could be called atma. An unchanging Unconditioned Atma is okay, Harvey also notes, Buddha describes Arahats as men of developed Atma. So Buddha is not refuting the Upanishadic notions at all.

Malcolm wrote:

The Upanishads are not proclaiming a personality structure as atman.

The Buddha clearly rejects an atman that is one of the five aggregates, all of the five aggregates, or separate from the five aggregates.

I see little ground to support the notion that Buddha supported the notion of a Self.

Harvey's discussion is very nuanced, and very precise, and to understand it, you will agree, one must read the whole text thoroughly and carefully because it is easy to be misled in the middle if you have not got all the way to the end.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

This is yet again another Hindu/ Advaitin view, which is wrong view in all yantras of Buddhism.

Jyoti said:

This view is of definitive meaning that has only one yana, that is the mahayana, regardless of tradition.

Malcolm wrote:
The proper term is Ekayāna.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:04 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?
Content:

deepbluehum said:

The Upanishads were not in full bloom then. Even in Upanishadic tradition, the atman is not seen as unchanging. Harvey and Werner recognized this when commenting that Buddha was not rejecting Upanishadic notions. There is a definite symbiosis going on here.

Malcolm wrote:
The Chandogya, which defines Atman as permanent and unchanging, predates the Buddha by three or four hundred years, as does the Brihadarayanaka.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 1:02 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?
Content:

deepbluehum said:

You're right except when Buddha said in DN 11, MN 49 and Iti 43, that Nibbana is an eternal consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:
No, these passages do not state that nirvana is an eternal consciousness. If they did, Buddha would just be a Vedantin following the Upanishads.

deepbluehum said:

Two words:

Dhuvam,
Anantam,

These mean eternal.

One word:

Vinnana,

Means consciousness

So perhaps he is an Upanishadic Vedantin. As much as the exclusivism of Buddhism has allured me, it's not supported. It's something I've had to take time to accept. But, read 'em and weep.

Malcolm wrote:

Anantam just means limitless (an+anta); it does not mean eternal.

Dhuvam can mean permanent, but more often is understood as continuous:

Dhuva

Dhuva (adj.) [Sk. dhruva, cp. Lith. drúta firm; Goth. triggws=Ohg. triuwi (Ger. treue, trost); Ags. tréowe= E. true, of Idg. *dheru, enlarged form of *dher, see dharati] stable, constant, permanent; fixed, regular, certain, sure D i.18; S i.142; iv.370; A ii.33; J i.19; v.121 (° sassataṇ maraṇaṇ); iii.325; Bu ii.82; Miln 114 (na tā nadiyo dh -- salilā). 334 (° phala); Vism 77; DA i.112 (maraṇaṇ apassanto dh.), 150 (=thāvara); DhA iii.170 (adhuvaṇ jīvitaṇ dhuvaṇ maraṇaṇ); ThA 241; Sdhp 331. -- nt. permanence, stability M i.326; Dh 147. Also Ep. of Nibbāna (see ° gāmin). -- nt. as adv. dhuvaṇ continuously, constantly, always J ii.24=Miln 172; PvA 207; certainly J i.18, v.103. -- adhuva (addhuva) changing, unstable, impermanent D i.19 (anicca a. appāyuka); M i.326; S iv.302; J i.393; iii.19 (addhuva -- sīla); VvA 77.

-- gāmin leading to permanence, i. e. Nibbāna S iv.370

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Malcolm, The previous two posts skirt the issue. What quality do both possess the one can see it in the other and thereby see it in themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Kadag, lhun grub and thugs rje, the three inseperable wisdoms of the basis.

deepbluehum said:

Dzogchen is almost unabashedly Vedantic in its functional procedures, which is why you were very defensive of Vedism previously, it take it. I could be wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't defending Vedism because it has something to with Dzogchen. I was pointing out that Vedic culture has had much valuable knowledge to contribute to the world, regardless of how brahmins may have behaved. Your focus is on the power and privilege

issue; my focus is on such thing as Ayurveda, Yoga, etc. We are really not talking about the same thing when we talk about "Vedism".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

You're right except when Buddha said in DN 11, MN 49 and Iti 43, that Nibbana is an eternal consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

No, these passages do not state that nirvana is an eternal consciousness. If they did, Buddha would just be a Vedantin following the Upanishads.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Take Dzogchen direct introduction, for example. The guru has to "get into that state," otherwise you can't. How is it possible someone can recognize the guru's state without a pervasive continuity?

Malcolm wrote:

Just as two different dharmas, for example, two instances of fire, possess the same dharma, for example, heat; likewise two different sentient beings also possess the same state without the need for some ontically established pervasive continuity.

deepbluehum said:

Heat is something you can feel and transfer from one thing to the next. How does the student feel the state or what is transferred?

How do the sounds of the Song of the Vajra emanate directly from Samantabhadra, if nothing is there?

Malcolm wrote:

We are not really discussing Dzogchen -- we are discussing your speculations about Śravakayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Take Dzogchen direct introduction, for example. The guru has to "get into that state," otherwise you can't. How is it possible someone can recognize the guru's state without a pervasive continuity?

Malcolm wrote:

Just as two different dharmins, for example, two instances of fire, possess the same dharmatā, for example, heat; likewise two different sentient beings also possess the same state without the need for some ontically established pervasive continuity.

deepbluehum said:

Heat is something you can feel and transfer from one thing to the next.

Malcolm wrote:

Just as two different dharmins, for example, two instances of water, possess the same dharmatā, for example, pellucidity; likewise two different sentient beings also possess the same state without the need for some ontically established pervasive continuity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Jeff said:

I would argue that everyone has equal access to everyone else's mind (body), but their perspective is obstructed.

Malcolm wrote:

Obstructions = lack of access.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Take Dzogchen direct introduction, for example. The guru has to "get into that state," otherwise you can't. How is it possible someone can recognize the guru's state without a pervasive continuity?

Malcolm wrote:

Just as two different dharmins, for example, two instances of fire, possess the same dharmatā, for example, heat; likewise two different sentient beings also possess the same state without the need for some ontically established pervasive continuity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 19th, 2012 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I was being a little coy. We don't all share one conditioned mind. But the unconditioned is shared, just like the space in the pots. So it doesn't mean same features. Otherwise how could he read their minds and be of "one mind." I think you are reading more into it than is there. It's quite plainly stated.

Malcolm wrote:

We simple do not understand this passage the same way. No point in discussing it further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

... the simile of Indra's Net from the Avatamsaka Sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

FYI, the origin of the Indra's net metaphor is found in the Atharva Veda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, this simply means that their individual continuums were freed of boundaries, not that there is only one mental continuum sharing three bodies. In other words, they have equal access to each other's mind, etc.

And it certainly does not mean that we are all just of one mind.

"eka" not only means "one" but can mean "same" in the sense of identical in feature i.e.

this pot is the same as the pot, they are identical pots. See one, see all, etc.

So I think you are reading something in that passage that is not there.

M

Jeff said:

Maybe we have a semantics issue... In non-duality, how would "equal access to each other's mind" (body) be different?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, they do not have the same type of access to other people's minds and so on.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I forgot I read Harvey already. He underscores that the suttas do not really deny a Self. He points to the same clauses I did to support that.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read it again. He does not state what you just said.

deepbluehum said:

Check the quoted passage I just posted. "One citta." We are one.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this simply means that their individual continuums were freed of boundaries, not that there is only one mental continuum sharing three bodies. In other words, they have equal access to each other's mind, etc.

And it certainly does not mean that we are all just of one mind.

"eka" not only means "one" but can mean "same" in the sense of identical in feature i.e. this pot is the same as the pot, they are identical pots. See one, see all, etc.

So I think you are reading something in that passage that is not there.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This "consciousness without feature" is the one-sided samadhi of cessation the Lanka-avatara asserts Arhats fall into, from which they are aroused to begin the Bodhisattva path.

Jnana said:

You remember, of course, that Nāgārjuna uses a version of the passage from DN 11 in his Ratnāvalī. There are also other sources, such as the Kāśyapaparivarta Sūtra, which describe the mind as being "anidarśana," etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is true. He uses the passage in the course of deconstructing the idea of an integral self.

Nāgārjuna commonly uses Agama passages to illustrate points the Nikāya schools and Mahāyāna hold in common. He also asserts in the Ratnāvalī that the teachings in the Sravaka canon are unable to bring one to Buddhahood.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I forgot I read Harvey already. He underscores that the suttas do not really deny a Self. He points to the same clauses I did to support that.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read it again. He does not state what you just said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

Sherlock said:

Changchub Dorje didn't realise rainbow body; besides Uncle Togden, it was Ayu Khandro.

Malcolm wrote:

CCD did realize rainbow body. Ayu Khandro did not realize rainbow body:

"Near the twenty-fifth, without any sign of illness, we found that she had left her body at the time she would normally be finishing her meditation session. She remained in meditation posture for two weeks and when she had finished her tuggedam, her body had become very small. We put some ornaments on it and many many people came to witness it.

"In the second month on the tenth day, we cremated her. There were many interesting signs at the time of her death. There was a sudden thaw and everything burst into bloom. It was the middle of winter. There were many ringsel and, as she had instructed, all this and her clothes were put into the stupa that she had prepared at the Sakya monastery."

I, Namkhai Norbu, was given the little statue of Jamyang Khentse Wongpo and a volume of the Simhamukha Gongter and her writings and advice and spiritual songs. Among her disciples there were few rich and important people; her disciples were yogis and yoginis and practitioners from all over Tibet. There are many tales told about her, but I have written only what she herself told me. This is just a little biography of A-Yu Khadro written for her disciples and those who are interested.

<http://www.khandro.net/book-womenofwisdom.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You just need to connect with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and not look back. He is the only teacher alive today that I know of who had two masters achieve rainbow body in this life.[/quote]

I know one is Changchub Dorje Rinpoche, who is the other?

thx[/quote]

His Uncle, Togden Rinpoche.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

username said:

Actually as I said before we consider all (17 historic) Hinayana schools such as Theravada (plus Mahayana ones) Buddhist but they do not consider Mahayana as buddhists & all of them consider Vajrayana not buddhist. This is much much worse than calling a path within Buddhism lower or higher or slower or faster, that was never answered here. If Hinayana establishment centers announce Mahayana as buddhists or both of them announce we Vajrayana followers are buddhists then they have made a Leap from the dark ages.

Jnana said:

Speak for yourself. This "us" vs. "them" dichotomy is not nearly as black and white as you seem to want it to be in order to justify your trip.

username said:

What a few say is irrelevant as official announcements from various establishment centers of both Hinayana & Mahayana sects, all of them, is required but this will never come. This is the real outrage & elephant in the room people like Reggie never answer & divert from by apparent emotions.

Jnana said:

Yes, it's a messy world.

Malcolm wrote:

He/she does have a point, Geoff.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I will see the text you cite. Generally, I'm familiar with the arguments. The Lanka-avatara sutra's claim about this makes no sense vis a vis the Buddha's assertions that they attain parinibbana. There wouldn't be someone to wake up. It is exactly the samadhi Buddha had when he passed. I don't really believe the Lanka-avatara sutra. As for it not being rigpa, as it is the opposite of avijja, it is vijja, vidya, aka, rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

If your standard for evidence is going to be a Pali sutra, all you will wind up with is a śravakayāna view. The śravaka canon does not present a complete picture. It is oriented towards people who merely want to escape.

"The ultimate of the lower is the relative of the higher"
--Shantideva.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 4:21 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?
Content:

deepbluehum said:
It says in the Kosha that color is form. It is not a materialist position. It is part of nama-rupa.

Andrew108 said:
It's saying that color is a form in dependence on the skandhas and the skandhas are?

deepbluehum said:
Andrew, please don't be pedantic. Just say what you want to say.

Skandhas are dependently arisen...

You will not do away with my point with this line of reasoning. The "consciousness without feature" is not dependently arisen.

Malcolm wrote:
That does not make it "pan" or "universal".

Each and every person who attains cessation experiences that continuum independently. Peter Harvey wrote quite a good book about this where he carefully goes through all the Pali sources.

The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism

I highly recommend it.

This "consciousness without feature" is the one-sided samadhi of cessation the Lanka-avatara asserts Arhats fall into, from which they are aroused to begin the Bodhisattva path.

It is not rig pa.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 4:18 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

It says in the Kosha that color is form. It is not a materialist position. It is part of nama-rupa.

Andrew108 said:

It's saying that color is a form in dependence on the skandhas and the skandhas are?

Malcolm wrote:

It is saying that color is a form [rūpa] that is part of the material [rūpa] aggregates, so color is based on the arrangement of the atoms of the four elements. Color is part of the secondary or derived matter of the rūpa skandha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

It says in the Kosha that color is form. It is not a materialist position. It is part of nama-rupa.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, it says that rūpa, the object of the eye (as opposed to the rūpa skandha) is color.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Actually in Dzogchen you don't have a view. You have an experience. You go beyond the mind. For a Dzogchen practitioner, the practice part has nothing to do with thoughts.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a "view", the experience to which you refer is the "view".

deepbluehum said:

It's not a sentence is the point.

Malcolm wrote:

Gaining mastery of the obvious, are you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Again, unlike you, I don't just acquieece when a monk tells me what to think.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't acquiesce to what anyone tells me to think.

I provided those sources for information.

And unlike you, I refrain from baseless ad hominem remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For context:

Where do earth, water, fire and air no footing find?

Where are long and short, small and great, fair and four –

Where are “name and form” wholly destroyed?

And the answer is:

‘Where consciousness is signless, boundless, all-luminous,

That’s where earth, water, fire and air find no footing,

There both long and short, small and great, fair and foul –

There “name and form” are wholly destroyed.

With the cessation of consciousness this is all destroyed.’”

Thannisaro renders it slightly differently:

Where do water, earth, fire, & wind

have no footing?

Where are long & short,

coarse & fine,

fair & foul,

name & form

brought to an end?

”And the answer to that is:

Consciousness without feature,[1]
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."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Actually in Dzogchen you don't have a view. You have an experience. You go beyond the mind. For a Dzogchen practitioner, the practice part has nothing to do with thoughts.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a "view", the experience to which you refer is the "view".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The universal Buddha consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing.

deepbluehum said:

I think Jeff disagrees with you. So does Garchen Rinpoche, such phrases like, "all pervading," even in Dzogchen texts, betray omnipresence, i.e., pan-psychism, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Thanissaro notes:

Viññanam anidassanam. This term is nowhere explained in the Canon, although MN 49 mentions that it "does not partake in the allness of the All" — the "All" meaning the six internal and six external sense media (see SN 35.23). In this it differs from the consciousness factor in dependent co-arising, which is defined in terms of the six sense media. Lying outside of time and space, it would also not come under the consciousness-aggregate, which covers all consciousness near and far; past, present, and future. However, the fact that it is outside of time and space — in a dimension where there is no here, there, or in between (Ud 1.10), no coming, no going, or staying (Ud 8.1) — means that it cannot be described as permanent or omnipresent, terms that have meaning only within space and time. The standard description of nibbana after death is, "All that is sensed, not being relished, will grow cold right here." (See MN 140 and Iti 44.) Again, as "all" is defined as the sense media, this raises the question as to whether consciousness without feature is not covered by this "all." However, AN 4.174 warns that any speculation as to whether anything does or doesn't remain after the remainderless stopping of the six sense media is to "objectify non-objectification," which gets in the way of attaining the non-objectified. Thus this is a question that is best put aside.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

From a Dzogchen point of view, such a samanyārtha (spyi don) is an intellectual analysis, an conceptual contrivance.

Of course, you can play with words if you like, and argue that concepts are experiences, but that is not the distinction that is being drawn here.

The experience of vidyā Longchenpa is referring to is not a samanyārtha, a generic image, even for a commoner. It is also never a result of conceptual analysis of any kind.

In other words, to tease it out for you further, as you admit, the object for a commoner meditating emptiness according to any system of Madhyamaka is a conceptual object which in truth is conceptual abstraction based on an intellectual analysis.

The "object", for a commoner meditating according to the system of Dzogchen, is always a non-abstract non-conceptual pratyakṣa [mngon gsum] of dharmatā.

The ultimate meaning of both systems is the same, but the means and praxis are quite different -- thus providing the reason why Madhyamaka, being a sutrayāna path, requires three incalculable eons to traverse the paths and stages; whereas the path of

atiyoga possesses only a single stage, traversable immediately.

M

cloudburst said:

Thank you for your informed and helpful answer.

I have many arguments with it, but don't see the benefit of debating it at the moment, especially as the gang here seems to be "of a view." Perhaps I'll be feeling more argumentative in the future, but for now, I hope you enjoy your summer!

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, enjoy your summer as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Seems like one of Jhoti's posts went missing?

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps someone figured out that she is not really adding anything of value to the discussion of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

wow i did not know that, there is alot i need to learn but im glad to be alive at the time of this great master and have the chance to connect with him.

im sure there will be many hardships but im happy to have discovered what ive been looking for,i just need to hold onto this enthusiasim for the ret of my life.

also afer i attend the WWT and join the DC will i be considered a disciple of Rinpoche? i know he has thousands of disciples,how do i go about having a personal relationship with CNNR?obviously to meet him in person is the goal but even then wont it be a huge amount of people trying to meet him at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for one thing he responds to emails. Secondly, people make a big deal out of close personal relationships with their teachers, but it is an over stated thing. ChNN teaches in such a way that you really won't need much personal attention. Plus there are many

older students who can help you with 98 percent of your questions. and you will be able to meet him and say hello. There is more chance for personal contact with him in smaller and newer places. It is impossible really in merigar, tsegylgar, etc.

Anyway, you won't have many questions that are worthwhile until you have applied the practices a bit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Jnana said:

Your qualms about this quote are nonsense for one reason: It doesn't matter where it came from. It's high f*cking time to stop using it as a meaningful term to refer to any contemporary Buddhist or Buddhist tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

The term Mahāyāna then ceases to have much meaning, no?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Jnana said:

I've never quoted it before.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps I have you confused with Tilt -- but I have certainly seen this quote used again and again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He is entitled to his opinion but he is factually incorrect. The term Hināyāna, it's usage and understanding is derived from Indian masters and their commentaries. It is really too much to imagine they were not referring their contemporary non-Mahāyāna colleagues.

Jnana said:

Of course it's derived from Indian sources. That doesn't make it any more palatable. It's

a divisive term with nasty connotations, as you yourself have acknowledged. It demonstrates quite well the all-too-human side of Mahāyāna Buddhism and the inescapable fact that this term is not the speech of the historical Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

In Indian Mahāyāna Sūtra and śāstra, in text after text, the word "hināyāna" is defined as the teachings followed by śravakas and pratyekabuddhas. I am certain that you do not imagine that these Indian texts were not referring to actual contemporary traditions?

It is useless to pretend that the term Hinayāna was not used by Indian Mahāyāna authors to refer to those who did not accept Mahāyāna sutras i.e. Sarvastivadins, Mahāsaṃghikas, Thervadins, etc.

According to Ray's statement "...it is really not appropriate to assume that the Tibetan definition of Hinayana identifies a venerable living tradition as the Theravada or any other historical school" one is left with the idea that term as it is used in Tibetan Buddhism has no precedent in Indian Buddhism.

This statement by Ray is nonsense for two reasons -- the way the term is used by Tibetans was determined by Indians. Those Indians certainly were referring to their contemporaries. Since this citation is not accurate at all, much less precise, you should not keep trotting it out as if it is a meaningful statement. It is not a meaningful statement at all since it is factually incorrect.

A factually correct statement would be "it is appropriate to assume that the Indian definition of Hinayana identifies then living traditions such as the Theravada and other historical schools..."

Another more or less correct statement might be "In absence of the polemical environment where the newly produced Mahāyāna movement was subject to constant criticism by conservatives among the Nikāya schools, Tibetans revisioned the term "hināyāna" in such a fashion that it no longer truly refers to any currently extant non-Mahāyāna tradition in a meaningful way".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: masters of the tradition

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

So whats the chance of becoming fully awakened in this lifetime after being introduced o your real nature?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a diligent person, have received introduction and applied the teachings of Dzogchen to your life in a concrete way, you will never need to fear of returning to

samsara's three realms ever again. Even if you do not achieve full awakening in this life you will either achieve full awakening in the bardo, or in a nirmanakāya buddhafiield.

RikudouSennin said:

well then i have found exactly what i have been looking for throughout my entire life

now only if i can manage to not die before i am introduced.

Malcolm wrote:

You just need to connect with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and not look back. He is the only teacher alive today that I know of who had two masters achieve rainbow body in this life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Milarepa -- too lazy to practise Dzogchen or no results?

Content:

Sherlock said:

There are two different versions of Milarepa's story about receiving Dzogchen teachings, in one he just slacks off because he hears about how rapid Dzogchen is and in the other he practises diligently without results until his teacher sends him away. Which is the older one?

Malcolm wrote:

The first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Mandala Offering in Ngondro

Content:

Sopa Yutso said:

I've checked WOMPT and Torch of Certainty about this, but am still lost... in the mandala section of the Barchey Kunsel, we make offerings to the "three realms and worlds, the beings and all their splendor..." Can anyone clarify what exactly these three realms and worlds are? They are not the form, formless and desire realms...?

Malcolm wrote:

They are. The worlds means all the worlds in the universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:
The universal Buddha consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:
There is no such thing.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:17 AM
Title: Re: masters of the tradition
Content:
RikudouSennin said:
So whats the chance of becoming fully awakened in this lifetime after being introduced
o your real nature?

Malcolm wrote:
If you are a diligent person, have received introduction and applied the teachings of
Dzogchen to your life in a concrete way, you will never need to fear of returning to
samsara's three realms ever again. Even if you do not acheive full awakening in this life
you will either acheive full awakening in the bardo, or in a nirmanakāya buddhafield.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 18th, 2012 at 12:13 AM
Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?
Content:

deepbluehum said:
Is everything permeated by this?

Malcolm wrote:
The three kāyas are the basis. Everything that appears to arise, arises from ignorance
[ma rig pa] of this basis. When one is in possession of knowledge [rig pa] of the basis's
actual state, and has integrated completely with that knowledge, then it is said that the
universe arises as the basis.

It is not complex, nor does it entail pantheism, panpsychism or anything else. It is what
it is.

M

deepbluehum said:

What it is is a Samkya Vedanta question. When It is what you say it is, it is compounded. When you are referring to faculties for the pragmatic approach to soteriology, what it is is irrelevant. You go straight to the finish where is, it or not are unnecessary to fashion.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is asaṃkṛita.

The Dzogchen tantras are aware of Saṃkhya as well as Vedanta, and take specific pains to differentiate Dzogchen view from these systems.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Is everything permeated by this?

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are the basis. Everything that appears to arise, arises from ignorance [ma rig pa] of this basis. When one is in possession of knowledge [rig pa] of the basis's actual state, and has integrated completely with that knowledge, then it is said that the universe arises as the basis.

It is not complex, nor does it entail pantheism, panpsychism or anything else. It is what it is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: rGyal tshab rJe Dar ma rin chen - UTTARATANTRA

Content:

gerdovan said:

Hi everybody,

I am looking for the Tibetan text of rGyal tshab rJe Dar ma rin chen's commentary on the rGyud bla ma ((UTTARATANTRA). Preferably not in Why lie.... can I download it from somewhere?

Can somebody help me with that?

Thank you!

Gerd

Malcolm wrote:

dar ma rin chen. "theg pa chen po rgyud bla ma'i TI k+ka/." In gsung 'bum/_rgyal tshab rje (bkra shis lhun po par rnying). TBRC W29194. 3: 5 - 440. dharamsala: sherig parkhang, 1997. [http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01ACI1%7CO01ACI101ACI23\\$W29194](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O01ACI1%7CO01ACI101ACI23$W29194) " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Jnana said:

Reggie Ray thinks otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

He is entitled to his opinion but he is factually incorrect. The term Hināyāna, it's usage and understanding is derived from Indian masters and their commentaries. It is really too much to imagine they were not referring their contemporary non-Mahāyāna colleagues.

Just run a word search on the bstan 'gyur for "theg pa chung" and you will be forced to come to the conclusion that term Hinayāna and its usage is not some Tibetan construction as presented by Ray.

Jnana said:

And the vajrayāna is merely upāya from soup to nuts.

Malcolm wrote:

This is hardly a fair assessment of the situation, though it is a fashionable sentiment post Sakya Pandita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Sure there is. Monism too. How else can the Dharmakaya be all pervasive so that two minds can unite?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what happens in Guru yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga Based on Pantheism?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I recently asked Garchen Rinpoche how Guru Yoga works. Garchen Rinpoche told me the nature of mind is omnipresent and permeates all beings which is why one can unite with the mind of the guru. I asked him if this was the same as the Hindu notion of Brahman? He said the Buddha only meant to refute a Creator God, but the notion of Brahman is basically fine with buddha-dharma. That was surprising to me.

Malcolm has also pointed out that in the Khandro Nyingthig texts Guru P has stated that everything is rigpa.

So does Guru Yoga betray the Pantheism underlying Mahayana, Vajrayana and Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Pantheism is an inappropriate term. There is no god in any form of Buddhadharma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: Letter of resignation

Content:

tobes said:

I

On what is unacceptable:

Malcolm wrote:

What is unacceptable is to give in to something you regard as evil and disengage.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I think it's more correct to say that the basis in gzhan stong (Shentong) is "Buddha

Nature," which is not EXACTLY equivalent with emptiness, at least according to Dolpopa's presentation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is exactly emptiness precisely in the fashion that I described it, even in Dolbuwa's presentation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

pueraeternus said:

I may follow along if deepbluehum remains unreceptive.

deepbluehum said:

Aside from your factual interpretations, show me in the suttas where Buddha himself teaches how his realization is superior to the Arahats.

Malcolm wrote:

Apprently you beleive the Buddha's teachings are confined to the Nikayas/Agamas. That is ok, but such sentiments are out of place in a Mahāyāna forum.

This is religion, here, not science. If you want science, you are in the wrong place and wrong faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

pueraeternus said:

This has nothing to do with the topic about comparing the fruits of a Buddha and the fruits of an Arhat. You are talking about what may be best for people of various dispositions. Fine if you want to start another thread and talk about it. This thread is off topic enough already.

dharmagoat said:

I'm done.

pueraeternus said:

I may follow along if deepbluehum remains unreceptive.

Malcolm wrote:

DBH is going through a phase, it seems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

All you do is argue online.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not all I do. What I do is translate texts and see patients. I sporadically engage in conversations here which are usually trolled.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually they don't.

If so, then you have to ask why the Arhat Mogallana was forced to ask the Buddha where his mother had taken rebirth, since his "divine" eye was insufficiently strong to see where she had gone.

deepbluehum said:

Then you have to ask how come buddha had to ask where had all his students gone after he came out of his cave retreat, when he didn't know they had killed themselves.

You can ask a lot of questions.

Malcolm wrote:

It is quite simple. According to the Nikaya tradition, the Buddha's omniscience is only operative when he chooses to direct his attention towards a given phenomena -- a Buddha is not omniscient 24/7, according to the Nikayas. Nevertheless, the Buddha's six abhijñās are completely unobstructed and fully developed. The development of the six abhijñās are not necessary for an Arhat, and even then, never can develop to the full extent of a Buddhas. Why? They lack the requisite past-life training as a bodhisattva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, like most one-sided polemicists.

deepbluehum said:

That's what you are, Mr. Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Unlike you, I am not pursuing a polemical agenda. I am happy to let people practice whatever the hell they want without telling them they are wrong, or screwed up, etc. If people want to believe that Arhats are omniscient, that's ok with me. I just don't believe it, and I don't think their citations or reasonings are sound. But I sure am not really that interested in arguing about it, I have better things to do with my time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What you guys are willfully ignoring is that the bodhi for an arahant is the same as a buddha, an arahant is an arahant sammāsambuddha. The Buddha clearly refutes any cognitive obscuration.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I understand that that is how it may seem to be defined in the Nikāyas and the Āgamas depending on how one chooses to read things, but the Śrāvaka canon is not definitive for me [though it may be for you] and then there is the fact that in general the Nikāya schools do not comment on things in this way indicates that Tilt's POV is a modernist revisionism.

In short, all samyaksaṃbuddhas are arhats, but not all arhats are saṃyaksambuddhas.

Śrāvaka-bodhi is not the same thing as the bodhi of an bodhisattva or that of a buddha. Please see the Abhisamaya-ālaṃkāra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The suttas that Tiltbilings cites in his thread refutes these commentarial threads.

pueraeternus said:

Tilt cites only the suttas that suit his cause.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, like most one-sided polemicists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

futerko said:

Hi Malcom, are you including Shentong Madhyamaka in this?

Malcolm wrote:

The actual mode of meditation in rang stong and gzhan stong are not different at all. The difference lay primarily in how they conceptualize the view in post-meditation.

futerko said:

Earlier you said, "the basis in Madhyamaka is emptiness, whereas the basis in Dzogchen is considered to be rigpa."

Presentations that I have seen tend to contrast the rang stong basis of emptiness with the gzhan stong basis of radiance, or the light of the clear light nature of mind which can only be realized non-conceptually and non-dualistically by the clear light nature of mind itself.

Is it only that the mode of meditation is different from Rdzogs chen, or are you also suggesting that this formulation of gzhan stong is still somehow conceptual?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis in gzhan stong is still emptiness, albeit is an emptiness qualified by the presence of ultimate buddha qualities, where samsaric phenomena are considere extraneous. Why? Because these ultimate qualities are only held to appear to exist in post-equipoise, but their appearance of existence disappear when in equipoise.

The equipoise in both rang stong and gzhan stong is characterized as an equipoise free from extremes. In the case of commoners, this freedom from extremes is arrived through analysis that negate the four extremes in turn. This is necessary even in gshan stong because attachment to the luminosity described by the PP sutras will result in an extreme view, just as grasping to emptiness results in an extreme view.

As I said, the most salient difference between R and S is in their post-equipose formulation. In terms of how adherents of the so called R and S views actually meditate, there is no ultimate difference.

The pitfall of both approaches is the same -- failure to eradicate all extremes results in the former grasping to non-existence as emptiness, and the latter grasping to existence as emptiness.

The purpose of Madhyamaka analysis is not to come to some imagined "correct" generic image of the ultimate, but rather to exhaust the mind's capacity to reify phenomena according to any extreme so that one's experience of conventional truth upon reaching the path of seeing in post-equipose is that all phenomena are seen to be illusions, dreams and so on i.e. unreal and yet apparent due to the force of traces.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Jnana said:

FWIW, according to the Theravāda Paṭisambhidāmagga a buddha has the following knowledges and abilities not shared by arhat disciples:

knowledge of the penetration of other beings' faculties

knowledge of other beings' biases and underlying tendencies

knowledge of the twin miracle *

knowledge of the attainment of great compassion

omniscience & unobstructed knowledge

The Theravāda commentaries also differentiate between sammāsambodhi, paccekabodhi, and sāvakabodhi. Accordingly, a mahābodhisatta develops the perfections, etc., to a greater degree in order to realize sammāsambodhi.

* i.e. the ability to produce fire and water from various parts of the body, as well as walk amid an aura of colors while a created image of his body sits or lies down, etc.

deepbluehum said:

The suttas that Tiltbilings cites in his thread refutes these commentarial threads.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually they don't.

If so, then you have to ask why the Arhat Mogallana was forced to ask the Buddha where his mother had taken rebirth, since his "divine" eye was insufficiently strong to see where she had gone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

futerko said:

Hi Malcom, are you including Shentong Madhyamaka in this?

Malcolm wrote:

The actual mode of meditation in rang stong and gzhan stong are not different at all. The difference lay primarily in how they conceptualize the view in post-meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 17th, 2012 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

The process of madhyamaka is based on intellectual analysis. Through this process of investigation, one develops insight. This new view is experiential, and this is the point of view of madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

After an eon of meditating perhaps. But while one is below the path of seeing one's "insight" is conceptual, and not experiential.

cloudburst said:

The point of view is either conceptual or not depending upon the meditator.

How long it takes to become the type of meditator for whom it is non-conceptual depends upon the meditator, the methods, the guru etc. Could be aeons could a few years , or monthsdays.... really it depends.

You have moved from saying that Madhyamaka is "just an intellectual analysis" to saying that conceptual is not experiential. I would say that for a yogi on the path of preparation meditating with ultimate example clear light, the point of view is technically speaking conceptual, but this means something very very different from "just intellectual analysis," doesn't it? This discussion is about the prasangika point of VIEW, and a view is necessarily experiential, as it is a view.

meditating on a generic image of ultimate truth with a mind of clear light is certainly experiential.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Dzogchen point of view, such a samanyārtha (spyi don) is an intellectual analysis, an conceptual contrivance.

Of course, you can play with words if you like, and argue that concepts are experiences, but that is not the distinction that is being drawn here.

The experience of vidyā Longchenpa is referring to is not a samanyārtha, a generic image, even for a commoner. It is also never a result of conceptual analysis of any kind.

In other words, to tease it out for you further, as you admit, the object for a commoner meditating emptiness according to any system of Madhyamaka is a conceptual object which in truth is conceptual abstraction based on an intellectual analysis.

The "object", for a commoner meditating according to the system of Dzogchen, is always a non-abstract non-conceptual pratyakṣa [mngon gsum] of dharmatā.

The ultimate meaning of both systems is the same, but the means and praxis are quite different -- thus providing the reason why Madhyamaka, being a sutrayāna path, requires three incalculable eons to traverse the paths and stages; whereas the path of atiyoga possesses only a single stage, traversable immediately.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

...but I won't say that the other vehicles are incapable of approaching gnosis and attainment of anuttarasamyaksambodhi on their own terms.

Malcolm wrote:

No one has said this.

pueraeternus said:

Glad to hear this. The way some of the dzogchen threads around here went, it gave a lot of people the impression that dzogchenpas think only through dzogchen can one attain complete enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

All nine yānas, including the yāna of gods and humans, lead directly or indirectly to full awakening. (boy this thread has gone off-topic)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Tiger said:

Also my criticism...

Malcolm wrote:

We are not actually interested in your criticisms. Not...even...slightly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: "No Thought" in Pao-T'ang Ch'an and early Atiyoga

Content:

Tiger said:

Nice paper.

<https://www.google.co.in/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=atiyoga&source=web&cd=41&cad=rja&ved=0CEgQFjAAOCg&url=http%3A%2F%2Farchiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de%2Ffojs%2Findex.php%2Fjiabs%2Farticle%2Fdownload%2F8661%2F2568&ei=cd4sUKSgJYuY0QXTmoGwDA&usg=AFQjCNFj1L4O70DaC5veMycwxj9jjCnz0Q> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Andrew108 said:

Why do you think it's a nice paper?

Tiger said:

For the historical analysis.

Malcolm wrote:

This article is quite outdated. This is a much more recent, more informed, and a more nuanced presentation of the interaction of Chan and Atiyoga in Tibet:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/49744856/Lighting-the-Lamp-An-Examination-of-the-Structure-of-the-Bsam-Gtan-Mig-Sgron> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

...but I won't say that the other vehicles are incapable of approaching gnosis and attainment of anuttarasamyaksambodhi on their own terms.

Malcolm wrote:

No one has said this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 7:32 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

cloudburst said:

also, is there an example of ignoreance that is not delusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the non-afflictive ignorance possessed by Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas, etc.

cloudburst said:

and a definition of extremes, if you will?

Malcolm wrote:

A one sided state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Whether or not Madhyamaka fails in exceeding an intellectual approach depends upon whether or not the meditator fails to exceed and intellectual approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamaka is based on intellectual analysis. It has no form of vipashyana which is uniquely distinguished from sūtrayāna in general.

When it comes to meditating vipashyāna, one does not sit there and engage in intellectual analysis ala madhyamaka.

cloudburst said:

The process of madhyamaka is based on intellectual analysis. Through this process of investigation, one develops insight. This new view is experiential, and this is the point of view of madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

After an eon of meditating perhaps. But while one is below the path of seeing one's

"insight" is conceptual, and not experiential.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 10:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

... The Prajnaparamita...

Malcolm wrote:

Lacks the explanation of lhun grub.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study more.

deepbluehum said:

You're being silly again. I know where your position comes from. You think Arahats have the cognitive obscuration. Because I practiced more, I realized it's bullshit.

Malcolm wrote:

Now whose being silly?

Even in the Pali canon Buddha makes it very clear that Arhats do not possess omniscience. Furthermore, Vasubandhu is extremely clear about this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Whether or not Madhyamaka fails in exceeding an intellectual approach depends upon whether or not the meditator fails to exceed and intellectual approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamaka is based on intellectual analysis. It has no form of vipashyana which is uniquely distinguished from sūtrayāna in general.

When it comes to meditating vipashyāna, one does not sit there and engage in intellectual analysis ala madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 10:29 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The attainment of nirvana may entail the end of suffering and delusion but not of ignorance.

deepbluehum said:

That's ridiculous. Nirvana is not possible unless there is the cessation of ignorance.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

While some dzogchenpa busy themselves in reasoning out about the simple matter of mahayana due to their distorted system, the mahayanist already ahead of them in the utilization of means which are definitive.

Malcolm wrote:

You are in the wrong forum. If you wish to criticize Dzogchen teachings, you may. Its your samaya, not mine.

I am done here.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

[

3. The alaya has karmic traces, but when it transformed as wisdom, it is the dharmakaya, same basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen tantras define ālaya as ignorance. It cannot be transformed into wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even rocks have dharmatā. Resting in the dharmatā of a rock is not really going beyond the rock. In fact, it can't.

pueraeternus said:

But we are not rocks. And since the embodiment of the dharmata dawns as the dharmakaya...

Malcolm wrote:

This amounts to saying that mind dawns as dharmakāya since the mind is the embodiment of its own dharmatā. But this does not correspond to how things are. It is a theory. Why? The dharmatā of the mind is not wisdom, and resting in it does not go beyond mind.

However, as Khenpo Ngachung pointed out, even if it is pointed out to those of the eight lower yānas that their vehicles never go beyond mind, they will not believe it -- which again is yet another reason it is pointless to argue or discuss Dzogchen with those who are not really interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Pero said:

Sure it is. You don't have to read even one sutra to practice Dzogchen and even if you do, it will not help your understanding of Dzogchen. You can't understand Dzogchen by trying to look at it from the POV of a lower vehicle.

Jyoti said:

Unless you practicing in cave blocking all outside interference, then you don't need the many tools of mahayana that is meant for busy practitioners whose mind cannot be free from the thinking of the various matters of daily life. The mahayana is not a lower vehicle, the classification of the yana by the nyinama is not universal in buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no basis for this discussion since there is no common ground for a discussion

at all. It is better to leave this here.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Yes, I'm capable, but I want your own interpretation on the matter, yet you can't even use your own terms.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, it is not correct to debate about Dzogchen teachings with people, especially people who have wrong views about Dzogchen. So I am not to about argue with you about your views and try to condition you. You have already sufficiently conditioned yourself into an incorrect view about Dzogchen teachings. It is up to you to condition yourself out of it.

However I will leave you with this much — If you do not differentiate mind and wisdom, you will not understand Dzogchen at all.

In Dzogchen, the all-basis (ālaya) is only a repository of traces. Ālaya is āvidyā, ignorance. From ignorance arises the eight consciousnesses. Ignorance of what? The ignorance that results from not recognizing the gzhi (sthana) i.e. the three wisdoms. All this is very clearly explained in many, many Dzogchen tantras and texts.

I have given you enough information so that you may untie yourself from the knot that you have created for yourself.

Good luck.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?

Content:

cloudburst said:

In his Gelug/Kagyu Mahamudra text the Dalai Lama advises Dzogchen practitioners to study Je Tsongkhapa's prasangika presentation of emptiness, saying that it would be "very beneficial."

Malcolm wrote:

While Jigme Lingpa in general gives Tsongkhapa's presentation of Prasanga in his Yontan mdzod; later, in the Dzogchen section he criticizes Madhyamaka in general for failing to be able to exceed intellectual analysis.

Longchenpa, half a century before Tsongkhapa, writes in his autocommentary to the Treasury of the Dharmadhātu in chapter 8:

This system of the natural great perfection is equivalent with the Consequentialist Madhyamaka's usual way of considering freedom from extremes and so on.

However, emptiness in Madhyamaka is an emptiness counted as similar to space, made into the basis; here naked pellucid vidyā pure from the beginning that is not established; that, merely unceasing, is made into the basis.

So in terms of freedom from extremes and so on, Madhyamaka and Dzogchen are identical. Where they differ is what is considered the basis [gzhi, sthana]-- the basis in Madhyamaka is emptiness, whereas the basis in Dzogchen is considered to be rigpa.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

[

Personally, I won't say that it does not really succeed, but that it uses different methods. In general, tantra (including Mahamudra and Dzogchen) has more efficient tools, or rather tools that suit a certain mentality.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very post-Sakya Pandita view of tantric teachings in general.

pueraeternus said:

Why do you think so? *Genuine question - this is not a challenge*

Malcolm wrote:

Even rocks have dharmatā. Resting in the dharmatā of a rock is not really going beyond the rock. In fact, it can't.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 5:30 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:

pueraeternus said:
But that is because you pigeon-hole it into that category and assume it to be so.
Prajnaparamita is also sutrayana, but that doesn't mean it is merely the transformation of vijñāna.

Malcolm wrote:
That depends on one's exegetical tradition i.e. yogacara or madhyamaka.

Basically, the Dzogchen critique of sūtrayāna in general is that even when sūtrayāna asserts wisdom beyond mind, it does not really succeed.

Even so, the emphasis of Chan is on dharmatā, not wisdom. Chan does not go beyond mind because it merely declares all things dharmatā.

That is not really going beyond mind.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 4:56 AM
Title: Re: Is Dzogchen Compatible with the Madhyamika Prasangika POV ?
Content:
Caz said:
?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, the difference is however that Prasanga is just an intellectual analysis where as Dzogchen is experiential.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 4:11 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:
cloudburst said:
also, is there an example of ignorance that is not delusion?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, the non-afflictive ignorance possessed by Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you assume the trikāya has something to do with vijñāna, then you would be correct. But that is not how the trikāya is understood in Dzogchen.

You need to read Primordial Experience, and understand how the Dzogchen tradition treats the cittamatra school and its doctrines so that you may correctly differentiate them. Otherwise, you will merely continue down this path of confusing yourself and others.

M

Jyoti said:

Why not just quote the text here or describe the content?

Malcolm wrote:

You are an intelligent person and capable of doing your own reading.

https://www.amazon.com/Primordial-Experience-Introduction-rDzogs-chen-Meditation/dp/157062898X/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1345057594&sr=8-1&keywords=primordial+experience " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Poor Jyoti. Seems like everyone is ganging up on him. But I'm sure some good understanding will come out of this.

Pero said:

True. Though it just sort of happened that way.

Malcolm wrote:

It is likely to happen whenever someone comes to the Dzogchen forum and starts asserting that Dzogchen is subordinate to common Mahāyāna.

Jyoti has obviously not read Manjushrimitra's rdo la gser zhun

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, as I said, Dzogchen has nothing to do with mind, vijñāna.

Jyoti said:

So you equate mind as consciousness (vijñana), to have nothing to do with consciousness, you would have nothing to do with the dhamadhatu and the trikaya, and your version of dzogchen would have no basis.

Malcolm wrote:

If you assume the trikāya has something to do with vijñāna, then you would be correct. But that is not how the trikāya is understood in Dzogchen.

You need to read Primordial Experience, and understand how the Dzogchen tradition treats the cittamatra school and its doctrines so that you may correctly differentiate them. Otherwise, you will merely continue down this path of confusing yourself and others.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Chan does not stop at the vijñana level.

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of Dzogchen, it does.

pueraeternus said:

It really doesn't, but there is nothing new in Buddhism for one tradition criticizing another based on incomplete understanding. Happens both ways.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it really does. Why? Because for Chan, being a sutrayāna tradition, wisdom is the transformation of vijñāna.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 2:08 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:

pueraeternus said:
Chan does not stop at the vijnana level.

Malcolm wrote:
From the point of view of Dzogchen, it does.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 1:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:

Jyoti said:
... as for the definitive meaning of dzogchen, I can find it in ch'an and the consciousness-only school...

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is a mistake. But it is your mistake so I leave you to it.

Neither Chan nor Cittamatra go beyond mind.

M

Jyoti said:
Defined mind, otherwise don't simply go beyond because a tradition said so. Both ch'an and the consciousness-only tradition focused only on consciousnesses and its transformation.

Malcolm wrote:
Right, as I said, Dzogchen has nothing to do with mind, vijñāna.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 1:36 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:

Jyoti said:
... as for the definitive meaning of dzogchen, I can find it in ch'an and the consciousness-only school...

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is a mistake. But it is your mistake so I leave you to it.

Neither Chan nor Cittamatra go beyond mind.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is an extreme because nirvana is a cessation -- as the etymology of the name implies. But this is all besides the point.

deepbluehum said:

It is a cessation of suffering and delusion. Who wants to keep that going? It's funny the transforms that happen due to clinging to dictionary thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

The attainment of nirvana may entail the end of suffering and delusion but not of ignorance. Hence, nirvana is still an extreme because it is a mere cessation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 16th, 2012 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Experience is required, questions and answers are what appears when one analyse the words of the teacher or scriptures. You need a question, in order to find answer within experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Meaning comes from experience.

You don't really need to ask that many questions about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: How can Buddhists be so sure of themselves?

Content:

My Socks Smell said:

Am I to understand that, unlike materialism, Buddhism is a belief system based upon the assertion that there is something after death for us to worry about?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind stream does not die along with the body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Well I studied and practice dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

From whom did you receive Dzogchen transmission?

Teacher and Guru -- not the same thing at all.

Dzogchen is not based on questions and answers. It is based on experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Point me to one dzogchen teacher who is still living who taught the sudden teachings without mixing with any gradual means in all of their teachings, and point me to a consciousness-only scriptures that teach the gradual method, then repeat the same statement above.

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Gandavyuha, etc

Jyoti said:

N.N also taught skillful means such as yantra yoga and development stage yoga, where is purity of the sudden approach? The demand for purity is simple, there should not be mixture of two different approach in any discourse, otherwise confusion is inevitable. Also those who rely exclusively on the definitive meaning, do not required additional aid of skillful means.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement indicates that a) you do not understand the teachings of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu b) that you do not understand Dzogchen.

Jyoti said:

The Gandavyuha is not a scripture of definitive meaning, and so would not be used by the consciousness-only school.

Malcolm wrote:

The Gandavyuha commonly considered a Yogacara sūtra.

There are a number of Yogacara sutras. Also for example the Saṃdhanirmocana is a gradualist sūtra belonging to the so called vijñaptimatra or cittamatra school -- a foundational text, actually.

It is fine if you want to consider Mahāyāna definitive. But that is just not how it is for we who follow the teaching of Dzogchen. We consider Dzogchen definitive, and everything else provisional. That is normal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Point me to one dzogchen teacher who is still living who taught the sudden teachings without mixing with any gradual means in all of their teachings, and point me to a consciousness-only scriptures that teach the gradual method, then repeat the same statement above.

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Gandavyuha, etc

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara is not commensurate with Dzogchen.

Jyoti said:

I didn't find difficulty deciphering dzogchen within the framework of consciousness-only system. They both belong to the sudden vehicle, but the consciousness-only system is purer as it is never a mixture of gradual and sudden teachings. The main collection of dzogchen teaching is from teachers who taught the gradual path of vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Both of your assertions are unsupported.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Not the version of dzogchen that I know.

Malcolm wrote:

Then the version you know has a problem.

There is an extensive literature differentiating the ālaya from the dharmakāya based on the second chapter of the primary root tantra of Dzogchen, the sgra thal 'gyur.

Jyoti said:

Not objecting the need to differentiate alaya and dharmakaya either, but on the context above on transformation of consciousness into wisdom, it is regarding the body (basis), both alaya and dharmakaya are not from a different body.

Referring to the mahayana tripitaka:

頓悟入道要門論云：「問束四智成三身者，幾個智共成一身？幾個智獨成一身？答大圓鏡智獨成法身。平等性智獨成報身。妙觀察智與成所作智共成化身。」以上雖說四智三身，並無別佛，只是一佛所具！三身具足，四智圓滿之佛果，即是究竟位，此即唯識行者之大目的，大歸趣！

My rough translation:

<<The 'Commentary on the main point of sudden realization' said: "On the question regarding the four wisdoms becoming the trikaya, which wisdoms that combined to form the one body? The answer is the mirror-like wisdom alone become the dharmakaya. The equality wisdom become the sambogakaya. The combination of both discriminative wisdom and equality wisdom become the nirmanakaya". Although the above talked about the four wisdoms and trikaya, there are no other buddhas, but being

possessed in a single buddha only! The perfection of the fruit of buddhahood that possessed the trikaya and four wisdoms is the seat of the ultimate, this is the grand objective and the meaning of the grand returning of the practitioner of the consciousness-only!>>

Here's the break down of the four wisdoms and their corresponding body and consciousness:

Mirror-like wisdom = dharmakaya = 8th consciousness (alaya-vijnana)

Equality wisdom = sambogakaya = 7th consciousness

Discriminative wisdom = 6th consciousness

Equality wisdom + discriminative wisdom = nirmanakaya

When one discusses on the stand-point of the body, the different terms are not considered different if they belong to same basis. But when one discussed conditions and method based on such conditions, those terms make a difference and should be differentiated in their respective condition.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara is not commensurate with Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I know. It seems Mahayana's nonabiding nirvana is jivan-mukti repackaged.

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is an extreme because nirvana is a cessation -- as the etymology of the name implies. But this is all besides the point.

It seems you have, for the time being, adopted the view that the Nikāya/Agamic Buddhism is the real stuff. Next you will be telling us that rebirth [punarbhava] is balony too, and that karma is bollocks.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What it boils down to is samsara vs. nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

What is boils down to is going to both, since both are extremes.

deepbluehum said:

That's that double talk. Nirvana is not an extreme. It is the middle between extremes.

Samsara fluctuates between extremes.

Malcolm wrote:

Dear fellow, from a Mahāyāna POV, nirvana is an extreme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What it boils down to is samsara vs. nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

What is boils down to is going beyond both, since both are extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Jyoti said:

Not the version of dzogchen that I know.

Malcolm wrote:

Then the version you know has a problem.

There is an extensive literature differentiating the ālaya from the dharmakāya based on the second chapter of the primary root tantra of Dzogchen, the sgra thal 'gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Andrew108 said:

What do you mean by body? Means is what exactly?

Jyoti said:

The body is what is permanent, uncreated, such as dharma, dharmakaya, dharmadhatu, nirvana and so on. The means is the functionalities of the body, it is made up of consciousnesses of the individual. There are 8 consciousnesses within the individual, only one is utilized as active means, the others as passive support, the body is actually the 8th consciousness (alaya-vijnana) which corresponds to the dharmakaya, it also acts as passive support. The active consciousness that is utilized as means is the 6th consciousness, this consciousness supports the thinking faculty and also discriminative wisdom, as long as this wisdom is activated, the 7th consciousness becomes support of the wisdom of equality. When these two are activated, the rest of the consciousnesses transformed into wisdom altogether.

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing to do with dzogchen which explicitly rejects the idea that the ālaya = the dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Malcolm,

Apologies. Actually, that part of the post was not a response to you, but to "Deep Blue Hum". I know that you have read enough Sutras and other Buddhist literature to probably not suggest abandoning monasticism entirely, though you are critical of it (which I have been around long enough to be okay with, I am not wearing rose coloured glasses).

The latter part of my post, about the TCVs, was directed to you and that is why your name appeared. Because in fact I think that the problem has more to do with lack of oversight in the Tibetan institutions than monasticism or celibacy.

I have heard several stories of such abuse at both Tibetan and Indian boarding schools from some of the children and local concerned Westerners.

Malcolm wrote:

What I was referring to was the systematic child abuse in traditional pre-modern Tibetan monasteries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Andrew108 said:

What do you mean by body? Means is what exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

he already defined it, he means dharmadhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

JKhedrup said:

So then why are we suggesting the abandoning of monasticism entirely?

Malcolm wrote:

Only one person made that suggestion and it was not me. Another person agreed, again not me.

Granted, I personally think that Buddhist monasticism is not very relevant in today's society, at least in the West, but that is a different issue.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

viniketa said:

My understanding is that that any such 'rivalry' came later than the Vedas.

deepbluehum said:

The Vedas came from the Kshatriyas. The rulers basically had these things produced. There are geneological records of Kshatriya families in Hardwar that go back thousands of years. Especially the Kshatriya clans were by varna and jati from the beginning.

Malcolm wrote:

Seems your trenchant antipathy should be directed at the Ksatriyas then.

However, we can, from a the point of view of the sutras, understand that when brahmins were respected, buddhas are born to brahmin families; when kṣatriyas are respected, they are born to kṣatriya families. This is a universal point of view in all Buddhist presentations.

As far as the Vedas coming from kṣatriyas -- we actually do not know the real origin of the Vedas. We have some guesses, some literary theories. The Hindutva people want to make the Vedas super ancient. Western scholars like Witzel suppose they are merely

3500 years old or so. Regardless of their origin, I personally think they are very interesting texts, especially the Atharva Veda, which is arguably quite late, but very important for Ayurveda and the Tantric movement in general.

We know that the early Upanishads were not brahmanical compositions, since texts like the Brihadaranyaka and the Candogya clearly state they contain the meaning of the Vedas that was not understood by brahmins, but only by kṣatriyas. The Buddha was clearly aware of, and rejected, Upanishadic ideas like the atman idealized as a luminous essence in the center of the heart -- ideas that were later recapitulated in Buddhist tantrism in a modified form -- thus, for example necessitating refutations of this idea in the Rig pa rang shar tantra, to give one example, in order to differentiate Dzogchen from Vedanta. Concepts like nadis, the five vāyus, etc., find their earliest literary expression in Candogya Upanishad, etc. Other concepts, like the five experiences of union with brahman which come from these early Upanishads are found regularly in Buddhist tantric texts i.e. smoke, fireflies, butter lamps, etc., as signs that the vāyu is entering into the avadhuti nadi. In short, while the metaphysics of Buddhist tantra may ultimately be grounded in emptiness, many, many concepts found in the Buddhist tantras, from a text critical point of view, find their earliest expression in the ten Mukhya Upanishads, also accepted as śruti by Hindus, but not by Buddhists, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Hsuan Hua on Homosexuality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, neither cannabis or opium is intended here. Smoking a specific blend of medicinal herbs that are good for the lungs is mentioned as part of dinācarya (regular conduct) in the Caraka Saṃhita.

Huseng said:

I stand corrected. However, it doesn't specify specifically what the substance is to be smoked.

《四分律》卷 43: 「爾時有比丘患風。醫教用煙。佛言聽用煙。」 (CBETA, T22, no. 1428, p. 877, a12-13)

“At that time there was a bhikṣu suffering wind. The doctor instructed him to use 'smoking'. The Buddha said using 'smoking' was permissible.”

Malcolm wrote:

Which Vinaya is this from. It is probably clear in the Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 8:08 PM

Title: Vinaya Reference to Smoking

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Topic split from here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=53&t=9638> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Huseng said:

《四分律》卷 43:「爾時有比丘患風。醫教用煙。佛言聽用煙。」(CBETA, T22, no. 1428, p. 877, a12-13)

“At that time there was a bhikṣu suffering wind. The doctor instructed him to use 'smoking'. The Buddha said using 'smoking' was permissible.”

Lotus415 said:

Interesting, since Hsuan Hua said in the comments on smoking provided in the link above that, " during that time when the Buddha was in the world no one knew how to smoke."

Huseng said:

They knew how to smoke and clearly did. It was part of Ayurveda. Again, it wasn't tobacco, but probably opium or cannabis. Also, this was for medical reasons, not to get high.

Malcolm wrote:

No, neither cannabis or opium is intended here. Smoking a specific blend of medicinal herbs that are good for the lungs is mentioned as part of *dinācārya* (regular conduct) in the *Caraka Saṃhita*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Cha Sum

Content:

alexa42 said:

First off, I'd like to say hello This is my first real post, though I've been a regular lurker. My question is, does anyone know what Cha Sum is? I recently requested a puja from Kopan to help clear some obstacles to my practice, and the Geshe la there suggested Tara puja, and Cha Sum... I've never heard of the latter and the little information I can find online suggests that it is used to clear obstacles related to spirits. Is anyone here familiar with this practice?

Malcolm wrote:
it is a common torma ritual from lower tantra.

cha gsum.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 7:42 PM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:
Tiger said:

I will elaborate further on the disharmony and even hostility of Indian religions, especially Buddhists and Brahmanists, which gives another picture from the unified "Dharmic religions" diatribe of Malhotra.

Malcolm wrote:
He does not claim that there never periods of friction between religious groups in India. He does not even claim they were unified. He merely claims that Dharmic religions have a common cultural source and common expectations.

In any event, the majority of instances you cite come from the very unstable post-Gupta period when North India was thrown into disarray after the invasion of the white Huns.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 11:28 AM
Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Read the article again.

David N. Snyder said:
Okay.
Research carried out by the BBC Sinhala service has revealed that over the last decade, nearly 110 Buddhist monks have been charged for sexual and physical assaults on minors in Sri Lanka.

He and another leading monk in the town of Anuradhapura, Namalwewa Rathnasara Thera, are currently released on bail in relation to the accusations - which they vehemently deny.
Innocent until proven guilty.

If they are guilty then the monks in question should be hung from the nearest tree (metaphorically); disrobed and placed in prison until their next life.

These are terrible crimes, if true. I don't know the statistics about which is more likely to

engage in such behavior (clergy or non-clergy), but I do know that when a clergy member or another person of power / famous person commits such an act or is accused of such an act, it is newsworthy. When the average Joe does so, it is not newsworthy. Thus, the media gives the illusion that celibate monks are all sex-crazed pedophiles, which is not the case in 99.9% of the clergy.

Malcolm wrote:

Unlike you, I have no confidence that Buddhist monastics are statistically less like to commit acts of sexual abuse than Catholic Clergy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I think it is a tired argument that monasticism leads to child abuse. There is child abuse anywhere where adults deal with children- boyscouts, boarding school, air cadets, softball, kindergarten have all seen many scandals.

David N. Snyder said:

Exactly. And most of the perpetrators are/were married older men, not celibate monastics of any kind.

Malcolm wrote:

Read the article again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Nirvana does not have this feature.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually the Pali sutras describe nirvana as deathless, permanent, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and therefore, you accept an uncreated and eternal tantra. Otherwise, you would have to assert that dharmakāya is a mere blank insentient voidness.

deepbluehum said:
How about this: What dharmakaya?

Malcolm wrote:
Right, you just became an annihilationist.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 1:11 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:
deepbluehum said:
...Vedic cosmological views leading to an eon of genetic subjugation and enslavement.

Malcolm wrote:
This is pretty outlandish.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:

deepbluehum said:
Pali suttas support the notion that Buddha rejected the notion of hereditary brahmins which was prevalent at the time, which is why he mentioned it.

Malcolm wrote:
The Pali suttas prove that varna was fluid and that people change their varna -- please examine the Ambhaṭṭha sutta in the Dīgha Nikāya.

They do not prove that Buddha rejected varna; merely that he thought personal moral character was of far greater importance than family lineage.

The Pali suttas however also, in keeping with the Upanishads, also support the idea that kṣatriyas were a better caliber of people than brahmins in general, which is why the Buddha was born in a Kṣatriya family -- since at that time they were more respected than brahmins.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:38 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal
Content:
deepbluehum said:
Tantras arise do to conditions, period.

Malcolm wrote:

Does the dharmakāya arise due to conditions?

deepbluehum said:

Doesn't arise at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and therefore, you accept an uncreated and eternal tantra. Otherwise, you would have to assert that dharmakāya is a mere blank insentient voidness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen tantras uncreated and eternal

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Tantras arise do to conditions, period.

Malcolm wrote:

Does the dharmakāya arise due to conditions?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The notion that sutrayana depends on taking a vow is an attitude ChNN reports about some version of Hinayana he had access to.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am not making this assertion based on his point of view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is invalid because it does not correspond to the mode of transmission of the teachings. Sutrayāna texts do not require any transmission because they are essentially paths of renunciation, not tied to any particular experience. Sutrayāna paths are based on taking a vow. This has caused confusion for many famous Vajrayāna scholars in all schools such as Sakya Pandita, etc., who assume that the function of empowerments and so on is to impart yet another series of vows. But this is a terrible

mistake. The function of empowerments is to impart experiences. Subsequent to having that experience, it may be important to guard a commitment regarding that experience, but without that experience the vow is useless.

Your idea that texts are sufficient, and can be treated exactly as formulas to be reproduced like for example, a drug formula, or a formula for synthesizing a plastic precisely demonstrates the pitfalls the western analysis of Dharma traditions.

deepbluehum said:
I don't agree with any of this.

Malcolm wrote:
It's ok, you don't have to.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 14th, 2012 at 12:05 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:

deepbluehum said:
Let me try to sew up a point here so that this might get back on topic. What's happening on this board with Western dharma is imagining a dharma that isn't real, a Pollyanna dharma. Vedic dharma has always been about heredity. The idea that from the primordial sound AUM emanated all the Vedas, the rishis the brahmans and all the castes is the basis for this millennial aged Eugenics program. Make no mistake, it is about racism. It's not good. It is a mind numbing evil. Shame on India for it. If you want to go get involved with that, you can't, you are barred by birth. You can go be an outcaste; see how you like it.

Malcolm wrote:
An analysis of the role of Varna in pre-5th century AD India shows that jati and varna were not so hard and fast. In fact the ossification of jati in India really is a function first of Mughal interference and secondly, British interference.

Incidentally, there really is no caste system in South India -- the area most free from colonial influence.

deepbluehum said:
Then, you look at Malcolm's new fetish for all things Vedic, I think it arises from the similarity of the Dzogchen tantras to the Vedas with respect to their "primordial origin" in the sound of "A."

Malcolm wrote:
You obviously have not been paying attention to my writing for many years. I have observed that Vedic ideas are important in Buddhism in a positive sense rather than the commonly assumed negative sense for the entire 17 years I have participated online in any fashion. I have always been interested in and felt positive regard for the Vedas.

Dzogchen, Tantra, and the Vedas, as well as some trends in Mahāyāna Sutra, all share common assumptions about śabda based on ancient Indian grammatical science.

deepbluehum said:

Here's a reason why India is so F'd up, it's the caste system. It makes people crazy. It makes the country crazy.

Malcolm wrote:

As noted above, the ossification of the caste system (in North India primarily) is largely a result of eight hundred years of external colonialism by first the Mughals and then the Brits-- imposing caste as a method of social control. It is not intrinsic to the Indian cultural idea of Varna or Jati. Any quick read of the Pali suttas proves this.

Further, the Dalit identity was largely created by Colonial Brits.

deepbluehum said:

The idea that Sanskrit itself encodes the primordial sounds of divinity is stupid bullshit.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not about Sanskrit per se --though for some Indians it may very well be. Nevertheless, no one can argue that Sanskrit is not a brilliant language system, and in fact modern linguistics up to Chomsky is based on it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Also, one of the main cases mentioned in the article was related to the abuse of the children by the lay workers of the temple, not the monks. So clearly celibacy was not the main cause of the abuse in that case.

Malcolm wrote:

Research carried out by the BBC Sinhala service has revealed that over the last decade, nearly 110 Buddhist monks have been charged for sexual and physical assaults on minors in Sri Lanka.

JKhedrup said:

I think it is a tired argument that monasticism leads to child abuse. There is child abuse anywhere where adults deal with children- boy Scouts, boarding school, air cadets, softball, kindergarten have all seen many scandals.

Malcolm wrote:

Mixing children with "celibate" males inevitably results in pedophilia. This is proven in the case of the Catholic Church, and is as it turns out, is broadly true in Tibetan

Buddhism as well. You just have no idea the number of stories I have heard from Tibetans about this issue.

JKhedrup said:

Lord Buddha in both the Mahayana and Theravada canon states the importance of the ordained sangha again and again, so I don't think labeling it as "no longer of use" should be taken lightly.

Malcolm wrote:

He also points out that by this time, it is merely a reflection of what it was back in the day.

JKhedrup said:

For me, my ordination has been the greatest teaching tool in my spiritual life. From the moments of utmost joy, to the moments where I considered re-entering laylife. It is a way of life which is suited to my character, aspirations and way of practice. Should such an option be taken away for those few seekers who can truly cultivate it?

For me celibacy really is a natural way of life and what I struggle with as a monk has mostly to do with the other restrictions (such as not being able to go out late at night dancing, having to work in an authoritarian structure etc.) I don't think the fact that being celibate is natural for me makes me grotesque or a pervert, although in modern society I am often made to feel this way, even with remarks from family and friends.

Malcolm wrote:

The issue is not personal choice, but institutional facts.

JKhedrup said:

Why was one of Buddha's first acts after leaving the palace to shave his hair and don the robe of a shramana?

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni Buddha was not the only Buddha. Not all Buddhas create a monastic sangha -- Sikhin, for example. And the answer is that in that day and age, shramanas were more respected as spiritual teachers than lay persons such as brahmins.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:
Take the Suttanta tradition for example.

Malcolm wrote:
Invalid example.

deepbluehum said:
So sayeth the King!

Malcolm wrote:
It is invalid because it does not correspond to the mode of transmission of the teachings. Sutrayāna texts do not require any transmission because they are essentially paths of renunciation, not tied to any particular experience. Sutrayāna paths are based on taking a vow. This has caused confusion for many famous Vajrayāna scholars in all schools such as Sakya Pandita, etc., who assume that the function of empowerments and so on is to impart yet another series of vows. But this is a terrible mistake. The function of empowerments is to impart experiences. Subsequent to having that experience, it may be important to guard a commitment regarding that experience, but without that experience the vow is useless.

Your idea that texts are sufficient, and can be treated exactly as formulas to be reproduced like for example, a drug formula, or a formula for synthesizing a plastic precisely demonstrates the pitfalls the western analysis of Dharma traditions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 8:46 PM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:
JKhedrup said:
It seems this thread is veering into another subject entirely, not that it isn't interesting...

Malcolm wrote:
As usual...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 10:43 AM
Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"
Content:

deepbluehum said:
Take the Suttanta tradition for example.

Malcolm wrote:
Invalid example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

PS There is a misconception that the efficacy of mantras depends on hearing it from the guru.

Malcolm wrote:

There are differences in how mantras are regarded in Buddhadharma and in Sanatana Dharma. It is best not to conflate the two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 13th, 2012 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I'm referring to the story that Garab Dorje's mother bore him in a virgin birth. Then he was a spiritually precocious child who won debates with monks. Jesus' mother was a virgin; he was spiritually precocious and won debates with the Saducees. This story is a retelling of Horus/Isis.

Malcolm wrote:

First, the Jesus story is not Gnostic. Second, Buddha's mother was a virgin birth, also the Buddha was a precocious scholar. So you do not need to look to the middle east for the pattern of the Garab Dorje's story, nor that of Padmasambhava. Both of the latter biographies are grounded in the Mahasamghika sources for the Buddha's birth story, etc.

deepbluehum said:

But I agree with the other influences you cite. Those are all at play, better yet interplay.

Malcolm wrote:

I was not citing them as influences, actually — there is absolutely no evidence to support such influences on Dzogchen teachings. There is merely some speculation by scholars working in the 1950's and 60's such as RA Stien and so on, who were working from inadequate understandings of the texts and the traditions.

deepbluehum said:

The way I see it is there's no beginning to dharma. All we have is an old conversation between many old traditions. There is no neat boundary for anyone to live in. Take the Black Throma system. It's Dzogchen right? Well how come the Mahamudra lineage has a practice of Vajrayogini arising without seed syllables or mantras? There's no real line there. Even the mind/nature of mind thing is just efficiency.

Malcolm wrote:

Krodhakali's kama tradition is through Padampa Sangye. This is why it is associated with Cho. Throma in the Dudjom system is a pure vision of Saraha -- it technically is not a treasure teaching.

deepbluehum said:

You have Dzogchen Tantras, but Bon Dzogchen don't need 'em.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many, many Bon Dzogchen tantras. And even so, there is clear intertextuality between so called "Buddhist" and Bon Dzogchen.

deepbluehum said:

What is essential...

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are just dissembling because you shot off your mouth without any evidence to back up your point.

deepbluehum said:

I hold that all methods, if they are factually efficacious, should be reproducible from texts...

Malcolm wrote:

This results in a sterile practice that produces not results. You cannot learn these things from books. The books are there to reinforce the oral tradition, not substitute for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, rather than speculate about what Dzogchen texts say, I read them. So I really am in a position to say whether or not there is so called "gnostic" influence on them or not.

Quite frankly, Vedic culture is much more a pressing influence in Dzogchen texts, if anything.

If you want to claim Gnostic influences on Dzogchen, you have to be very specific, give

examples -- cite a text, show how some intertextuality -- prove a connection. If you can't, you are just spouting hot air.

deepbluehum said:

I gave you one. It's pretty simple. I guess you didn't want that one.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you didn't -- you made a vague and non-specific reference to the biographies of four persons.

Which Gnostics? Which texts? You would be on firmer ground arguing for pre-Muslim Iranian influences such as Zoroastrianism on Dzogchen. A possible Manichaean influence would be the notion that our bodies contain a "spiritual light". But this spiritual effulgence can easily also be seen as an influence from Shaivism where primordial sound flashes forth as light and then rays (see Padoux, Vāc, The Concept of the Word in Selected Hindu Tantras). Or, as I prefer to view it, the Dzogchen tantras do not necessarily owe any debt to any tradition, but instead are the product of the realization of Buddhist yogis.

As I said, those who make arguments for external influence on Dzogchen, apart from its obvious grounding in Buddhadharma, do so very speculatively and with a lack of textual support.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

My point is that the western academic notion that the Buddha rejected Vedic culture is a complete distortion.

Michael_Dorfman said:

Which scholars do you have in mind? The most recent work I can think of on the relationship between the Buddha and Vedic culture is Gombrich, and he's certainly not arguing that it is a simple rejection; rather, he argues that the Buddha intentionally echoed and re-deployed Vedic notions in a new, sometimes parodic manner.

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily 19th century scholars who sought to embed in Buddhism their own protestant values. However, such ideas have become deeply embedded in Buddhism's reception in the west and you often see these ideas repeated:

Buddha rejected the Vedas (he didn't and in fact refers to the Gayatri as the chief of all mantras)

Buddha was a reformer (he wasn't anything of the sort)

Buddha rejected jati and varna (he did not -- but he reframed the idea of a "brahman" as

an ethical quality; but this did mean he neglected the value of brahmins in Indian society as a whole)

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Reading a bit about this book. The thing about "mutual respect" is a bit of a slight of hand on his part. He is basically trying to get other religions to respect Hindu ideals.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think his point is that facile. For example, Buddha actually did respect other paths, even if he did not sign off on them.

viniketa said:

Though I wouldn't exactly call it 'slight of hand', here, deepbluehum has a point. Malhotra defines 'respect' specifically as 'mutual respect', which means, to him, admitting that all paths lead to the divine. He does this knowing full well Abrahamic religions cannot accord mutual respect due to their exclusivism. Buddha would have had to 'sign off on them' to meet Malhotra's criteria.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so -- he addresses this point and includes Carvaka and Lokayati schools as well. You guys have not read this book carefully enough.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Any similarities in the birth stories of Padmasambhava, Garab Dorje, Jesus and Moses are incidental.

There are no gnostic influences on Dzogchen. Any imagined influences are purely speculative and not grounded in any concrete fact, historical or textual.

deepbluehum said:

You mean to say the textual similarity is not a textual similarity? You love Dzogchen too

much. Everything about the origin of tantras is speculative. That's what the Tibetans need to figure out.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, rather than speculate about what Dzogchen texts say, I read them. So I really am in a position to say whether or not there is so called "gnostic" influence on them or not.

Quite frankly, Vedic culture is much more a pressing influence in Dzogchen texts, if anything.

If you want to claim Gnostic influences on Dzogchen, you have to be very specific, give examples -- cite a text, show how some intertextuality -- prove a connection. If you can't, you are just spouting hot air.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What you are ignoring is the fact that Buddha used cultural Aikido on the Hindu world. Which in turn, they did back. This is the "Dharmic world." There was never any real respect for each other. The Buddha's story about the Vedic rite for his funeral is not what you think. There is a nonchalantness about it. If you live in Indian culture you can see this first hand how "respect for others" is given in a nonchalant way. In India, it's path of least resistance. It is way different than adoption. The Thai are playing imitation. The world has a hell of a time with India. India transcends reasons. The Western scholars are correct, Buddha was mocking Vedic cosmology. It's a very Indian kind of humor, very subtle and ironic, but the undertone is a death blow.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha just did what all Indians did -- he had a palate and used it. He was not doing "aikido" of any kind. He was not trying to upset any applecarts. The whole idea that Buddha was trying reject the so called system of varna and jati is complete crap.

The Buddha's recommendations for his funeral was exactly what I said it was. -- shramanas were not expected to conduct in such rites, it was not in their job description.

My point is that the western academic notion that the Buddha rejected Vedic culture is a complete distortion.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 9:00 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What also comes to mind are texts like "The Sermon on the Mount According to Swami So and So," interpreting Christianity in Hindu terms. Everything this guy blames the West of doing, Hindus did it too. He's doing underhanded Hindu proselytizing. This is exactly the kind of empty debate the Buddha warned of.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is actually being quite above board. He is making a cogent argument about a certain flexibility that Dharmic culture sustains, that Abrahamic cultures cannot.

What he is saying is not new-- for example, Bataille makes a distinction between festival cultures which regularly engage in the destruction of surplus value and hegemonic cultures which suppress such destruction (see *The Accursed Share*). Or exam the interesting essay from Ten Thousand Plateaus called *Nomadology*.

What Malhotra is interested in, among other things, as driving home the fact that western academic myth of the Aryan Invasion Theory, etc. has created many distortions of Indian culture. This is not to say that there are no linguistic continuities between peoples in the so called IE continuum. But languages are not peoples.

Also I find his work appealing, especially as someone who has abandoned Buddhist chauvanism -- and such chauvanism is essentially a Western phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:52 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Also let's not forget the similarity of the birth and childhood stories of Jesus and Garab Dorje, Padmasambhava and Moses. Scholars have noticed the gnostic influence on Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean they have imagined such an influence.

deepbluehum said:

It's a bit of a glaring similarity, bordering on plagiarism.

Malcolm wrote:

Any similarities in the birth stories of Padmasambhava, Garab Dorje, Jesus and Moses

are incidental.

There are no gnostic influences on Dzogchen. Any imagined influences are purely speculative and not grounded in any concrete fact, historical or textual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Reading a bit about this book. The thing about "mutual respect" is a bit of a slight of hand on his part. He is basically trying to get other religions to respect Hindu ideals.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think his point is that facile. For example, Buddha actually did respect other paths, even if he did not sign off on them.

What Malhotra was pointing out was that in general, in ancient India there was a cultural flexibility that could accomodate a pluralistic religious and social culture in ways that Abrahamic religions just cannot.

But when we read Indian polemics through western eyes, we tend to reify these debates into evangelisms that are just not present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Reading a bit about this book. The thing about "mutual respect" is a bit of a slight of hand on his part. He is basically trying to get other religions to respect Hindu ideals. Only Hindus think all paths are equally paths to god. Almost all other religions are exclusivist, Buddhism included. Did Buddha respect Hindu ideas? Not really, he satirized them.

Malcolm wrote:

We have a very skewed view of Buddhism on the ground in ancient and how it was actually practiced -- we derive our view of Buddhism in India through the lense of a few polemical scholars, ignoring many inconvenient facts. For example, that fact that the Thai court still maintains brahmin priests, and has done so for hundreds of years, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Also let's not forget the similarity of the birth and childhood stories of Jesus and Garab Dorje, Padmasambhava and Moses. Scholars have noticed the gnostic influence on Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean they have imagined such an influence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

tobes said:

If we are to speak of a western universalism, surely it is a/ the ideology of liberal-democracy and b/ the political economy of neo-liberalism. The vast majority of Indian students head to western institutions to learn about demand, supply, finance and management. This has nothing to do with German idealism, history or monotheism - and everything to do with the logic of utility.

And in India, this logic has become extremely powerful - if there is a national undercurrent at the moment, it is: economic growth, I.T., infrastructure, wealth creation. Little of that is Vedic.

So I just think Malhotra has the wrong end of the stick here.

Malcolm wrote:

All of these things that you mention are a logical extension of the ideological currents that begins with the Enlightenment. Malhotra addresses the Indian capitulation to the exact type of Western Universalism you mention above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Agreed, "how" is a question for another thread.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Western "Buddhists" could start by recognizing the value of Vedic culture and its overwhelming contribution.

Western Tibetan Buddhists could start by dropping their obsession with validating their narratives in contradistinction to Bon narratives.

Theravadins could drop their obsession with finding "original Buddhism". etc.

deepbluehum said:

Hey don't blame White Man for everything. The Red Men of Tibet are pretty damn obsessed with their lineages and historical validity. Somehow White Man and Red Man combine to obscure the Indian persuasion.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are -- this is a symptom of a type of historical consciousness that the Sinosphere possessed that the Indosphere was rather lacking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you read the Pali Canon, you can find that Buddha himself was not ill-disposed towards Brahmins, or tradition Vedic religion per se. He simply disputed certain theories still popular among Hindus. A good source for this is the Mahaparinibbana sutta in the Digha-nikāya.

viniketa said:

Thank you for the reply. Of the above, I am aware. I am interested in the idea of his rejection of śruti, per se. Or, did you mean, earlier, that he rejected "shruti, uncreated and eternal" as a package?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, uncreated and eternal shruti, as a package.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He rejected the idea that the Vedas were shruti

viniketa said:

Thank you, Malcolm. I would like to learn more about this, if you could point to a source. It is confusing, given the nature of the śrāvaka tradition in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

If you read the Pali Canon, you can find that Buddha himself was not ill-disposed towards Brahmins, or tradition Vedic religion per se. He simply disputed certain theories still popular among Hindus. A good source for this is the Mahāparinibbāna sutta in the Dīgha-nikāya.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Throma Nagmo Teachings by Lama Tharchin Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Elaborate ritual does not necessarily equate with mahāyoga. It is the style of creation that determines whether something is Mahayoga or not. Just so you know, I have the complete transmission of this cycle and over the years have practiced it a lot.

Yudron said:

Dudjom Lingpa's Throma sadhanas with tsog combine mahayoga, chö, and the view of Atiyoga in a unique way -- it's really something...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

alpha said:

i dont want to be difficult but why is CNNR asking his disciple things he cant do himself. According to him the one who can integrate ,in this instance, with the fire element will get permission from him to teach dzogchen.

Why is he not saying for example .."if you at least have my knowledge of dzogchen and my level of integration then you can teach dzogchen to others".

Malcolm wrote:

No, what he said was if you can do this, then he wants to take teachings from you!

As for the second statement, he is saying that, all the time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Hsuan Hua on Homosexuality

Content:

Huseng said:

I think it has more to do with the widespread fear among Chinese Buddhist bhikṣus about Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is fundamentally based on racism against Tibetans.

Huseng said:

Where do you get that idea?

Malcolm wrote:

History.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Hsuan Hua on Homosexuality

Content:

Huseng said:

I think it has more to do with the widespread fear among Chinese Buddhist bhikṣus about Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is fundamentally based on racism against Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Hsuan Hua on Homosexuality

Content:

Jnana said:

I also think that there are a couple of points worth mentioning: (1) a bodhisattva practicing on any of the first six or seven bhūmis isn't perfect, they still have cognitive and afflictive obscurations; and (2) there's no reason why an āryabodhisattva would have to automatically adopt liberal Western values upon attaining the first bhūmi.

Huseng said:

I still have to wonder where he got the idea that most Lamas have AIDS.

Malcolm wrote:

He is a racist, obviously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 12th, 2012 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha was a Vedic Indian.

viniketa said:

We often see it written that Guatama Buddha 'rejected the Vedas' or 'rejected the authority of the Vedas', while it is my understanding that he rejected the authority of certain groups of Brahmin priests. See Stephen Knapp: http://www.stephen-knapp.com/buddhism_and_its_vedic_connections.htm " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

He rejected the idea that the Vedas were shruti, uncreated and eternal. Of course, such ideas are key in Dzogchen where we find the Dzogchen tantras are uncreated and eternal in the same sense the Vedas were held to be.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apaurusheyatva> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

JKhedrup said:

My appreciation for Vedic culture arose after my arrival in India. Though I'm a Buddhist monk with firm refuge in the triple gem, I wanted to understand the broader culture from which the dharma arose.

This led me to travel to various Hindu and Jain holy sites on the subcontinent such as Vrindavan, Varanasi and several ashrams. Though the Buddhist teachings are definitely "for me", the thread that runs through these dharmic traditions is one of mutual reciprocity and development. Some developments in Buddhism closely mirror those of Hinduism during a certain time period and vice versa.

As an aside, does anyone know what philosophy of "Hinduism" was held by the family of Siddhartha Gautama, Lord Buddha? What would the practice of his family have been like?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha was a Vedic Indian. For example, when he died he recommended to Ananda that "faithful" brahmins could handle his funeral rites. Just because he rejected the mechanical efficacy of brahmanical rites, he understood their deeper import. Thus, all the parts of the Stupa are named after parts of the Vedic Agnihotra precinct, including the so called "srog shing" or yaṣṭi (central pillar of the stupa), to which the animal was to be tied in preparation for the yajñam (mchod sbyin), the offering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

JKhedrup said:

Agreed, "how" is a question for another thread.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Western "Buddhists" could start by recognizing the value of Vedic culture and its overwhelming contribution.

Western Tibetan Buddhists could start by dropping their obsession with validating their narratives in contradistinction to Bon narratives.

Theravadins could drop their obsession with finding "original Buddhism". etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Osho said:

We have neo Sufis here in the UK who seem to do little else but fire walk and place their unblemished hands onto red hot coals. They're not necessarily 'realized beings' but it does make for good theatre.

Malcolm wrote:

Um.... that is not what he means. He means putting one's hand in a fire and leaving it there indefinitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I only wish that Buddhist countries like Singapore had a Buddhist voice similar to Malhotra's in order to challenge the shift in culture that is leading to a youth uninterested in the teachings of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Sooner or later those of us who are proponents of Dharma culture are going to have to put aside our western style "faith commitments" and find a common ground in the Dharma, which is a pluralistic decentralized religious culture.

If we don't, then the culture of Dharma will vanish.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Throma Nagmo Teachings by Lama Tharchin Rinpoche

Content:

Yudron said:

The tertön himself never used that language to describe any aspect of the medium or short deity practice, or the cycle in general, and neither did Dudjom Rinpoche in the supportive texts.

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Throma, in all sadhanas, is explicitly described by Dudjom Rinpoche as a called "Ati syle of creation" i.e. instant recollection without any seed syllable at all. In the retreat manual it is stated:

"Here, the unelaborate ati creation beyond the conventions of the three samadhis is the universe arising as the basis, the self-originated naturally formed mandala, the totally perfect (rdzog chen par) self-visualization in a moment of recollection in the manner of a fish leaping from the water."

Since the goal of Anuyoga is atiyoga, it is fair to say that actually the Throma is ati of anu. Anu because it involves transformation, ati because the principle of creation is a self-originated naturally formed [rang byung lhun grub] mandala.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Osho said:

If one accepts 'linear historicity' as if-this-then-that causal temporality then it surely must be taken as underpinning later western empiricist philosophies, all of them

including Malhotra who has both feet rooted firmly within the western methodological approach albeit the PoMo subaltern. The enlightenment project did not spring fully formed from the void and the subaltern is its child not its live in domestic help. Dawkins is, after all; an evangelist as were those of his predecessors cited above. Malhotra is non different.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are missing a critical point: that of the purva-paksha. Malhotra is equally critical of Dharmic religions present lack of sophistication in constructing purva-pakshas i.e. "prior positions", to show that they readily understand the thought and implications of the intellectual (and in this case, cultural as well) opponent's POV. He devotes an entire chapter to purva-paksha, a discipline really unknown outside of Indian polemics. He introduces the concept in the first chapter:

The corrective to this problem in my view is the ancient and powerful Indian practice of 'purva paksha'. This is the traditional dharmic approach to rival schools. It is a dialectical approach, taking a thesis by an opponent ('purva pakshin') and then providing its rebuttal ('khandana') so as to establish the protagonist's views ('siddhanta'). The purva paksha tradition required any debater first to argue from the perspective of his opponent in order to test the validity of his understanding of the opposing position, and from there to realize his own shortcomings. Only after perfecting his understanding of opposing views would he be qualified to refute them. Such debates encourage individuals to maintain flexibility of perspective and honesty rather than seek victory egotistically. In this way, the dialectical process ensures a genuine and far-reaching shift in the individual.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism (Kindle Locations 842-848). . Kindle Edition.

And:

Unfortunately, this tradition was not operative when Islam, Christianity and the European Enlightenment entered India. Rather than engaging in purva paksha with Islam and Christianity, or more recently with Marxism and secularism, the dharmic philosophers tended simply to ignore these foreign entries or else defer to them by adopting the attitude that 'all is one'. This stance, a misreading of the dharmic teachings, became an excuse for abandoning purva paksha, for if there are no differences, there is nothing important at which to gaze. The purva paksha method of engagement can engender sympathy as well as distance, understanding as well as critique. It must, however, retain several qualities not often found today: direct confrontation, clarification of difference, and an assumption of equality. Purva paksha should take place with transparency in as open a forum as possible and in such a way as to benefit each party. Acceptance of the need and potential for change should be a baseline from which to work.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western

Universalism (Kindle Locations 856-863). . Kindle Edition.

In other words he is equally critical of the Indian failure to engage the West with a purva-paksha, something it credits the Chinese for having done historically from the beginning of their engagement with the West.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

to be said:

I see linear historicity as grounded far more in Enlightenment philosophies which were really running against the Abrahamic religions. i.e. Darwin, Hegel, Marx et al and conceptions of historical progress.

Malcolm wrote:

'While Christianity claims a divine mandate to superimpose its own history-centrism on the entire world, thinkers of the European Enlightenment have also developed various conceptual absolutes and endowed these with 'universal' status. The profound assumption is that the shape and direction of world history are leading to a single Western goal – be it salvation or scientific secular progress.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism (Kindle Locations 5079-5082). . Kindle Edition.

But it was Hegel, among all German thinkers, who had the deepest and most enduring impact on Western thought and identity. It is often forgotten that his work was a reaction against the Romantics' passion for India's past. He borrowed Indian ideas (such as monism) while debating Indologists to argue against the value of Indian civilization. He posited that the West, and only the West, was the agent of history and teleology. India was the 'frozen other', which he used as a foil to define the West.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism (Kindle Locations 5174-5178). . Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: History of 17 Tantras

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

. . . the sgra thal 'gyur tantra is the root of all Dharma. It is the first Dharma ever taught to sentient beings. Every other Dharma comes from it.

M

dakini_boi said:

Where can I find out more on the history of the 17 Dzogchen Tantras? Where is it said that the sgra thal gyur was the first dharma taught to sentient beings?

Thankyou

Malcolm wrote:

In the sgra thal 'gyur, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

tobes said:

I think it's a huge (and wrong, and bad) reification of 'western' epistemic/ hermeneutical frameworks.

Malcolm wrote:

He adresses this objection in his book early on.

tobes said:

What is his argument?

Malcolm wrote:

In making these arguments, I may be accused of using broad definitions, generalizations and extreme contrasts. When I speak of 'the West' vs 'India', or the 'Judeo-Christian religions' vs the 'dharma traditions', I am well aware that I may be indulging in the kind of essentialism that postmodern thinkers have correctly challenged. I am also aware that such large categories comprise multiple traditions which are separate and often opposed. I view these terms as family resemblances and guides, not as reified or immutable entities. Furthermore, most people do understand them as pointing to actual entities with distinct spiritual and cosmological orientations, even if they can only be defined in opposition to one another. The terms can thus be used as entry points for debate and as foils to contrast both sides, which may help deepen our understanding.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism (Kindle Locations 110-116). . Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is very interesting is that way Western ideas of historicity shape our concerns about the Dharmas we westerners choose to learn. These ideas are very foreign to the spirit of Dharmic religions, at least as expressed through Malhotra's book. I cite all of the endless debates about whether Mahāyāna was taught by the Buddha; whether the Pali Canon is the "real" Buddhism. Whether Vajrayāna is as valid as Mahāyāna, or more recently, the abortive debate over the historicity of Bon accounts of their religion.

Malhotra argues:

Itihasa is also fundamentally pluralistic: there are usually a variety of versions. A remodelled account or a new version of a narrative does not nullify all others. There is no burning of old books to erase past versions. What gets rejected is simply ignored, possibly to be revived or revisited at a later time when it might again become contextually relevant. Hence, in India one finds ancient customs coexisting with those from later periods. An open past serves as a creative resource for future generations who might want to explore the roads not taken. The Western unfolding of history, on the other hand, does not have room for parallel streams, finding them threatening and hence believing it safer to display them in museums (i.e., not as living traditions but as dead ones). But collapsing all variations into a mono-history only produces a mono-culture. Such a lack of understanding and insight causes itihasa to get misconstrued as myth vis-à-vis some putative 'reality'.¹³

The West demands that its myths be historicized so that they may be claimed as true. Indians do not carry the burden of history-centrism and so are under no pressure to present their myths as history.

There are multiple stakeholders who compete for their respective versions of history to prevail. Power is always at work in the construction of history. (History is written by the victors, as the popular adage goes.) More often than not, history is arbitrary in terms of what is included and what is not, what is emphasized, whose point of view is privileged, what values get superimposed, and so forth. In the West, a powerful apparatus and elaborate process have evolved to present history, and the transformation of Western myths into fact remains a major preoccupation of the Western humanities.

Malhotra, Rajiv (2011-10-10). *Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism* (Kindle Locations 1123-1136). . Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I also know that there are western practitioners who have genuine realization, but they are somewhat undervalued.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by realization.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's definition is very stringent. If you can place your hand in fire without it being harmed, then he will consider you realized. Since he himself cannot do this, he does not consider himself realized, just a little more experienced than we, his students.

I personally believe he is an arya, someone who is actually an awakened person -- but that is just me.

M

Nighthawk said:

You think he is a full fledged Buddha or just someone who is realized?

Malcolm wrote:

I think he is someone who has the constant knowledge of his own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

But it's a good point. How many realized beings are there in the world? Who is becoming realized in the West? How many have become enlightened in the last ten years? Twenty years? Fifty? The last century?

Malcolm wrote:

I can think of at least five people within the past 15 years who achieved total realization -- two bonpo in Tibet, a couple of buddhist yogis in repkong, Khenpo Acho is famous. I am sure there are more.

underthetree said:

It gave me pause to read the recent thread on Buddhist saints. Every candidate was from the Middle Ages at the very latest.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah...there are plenty of saints, enough to go around for everyone, even in this century, Buddhist, Bonpo and Hindu -- even Christian.

alpha said:

How about westerners?

How many of those you know who have been educated in the west have achieved ,are very close to achieve or just about to achieve total realization or are very far gone , almost continually integrated,day and night ,free ,totaly free, nearly free,just about to be free?

How many?

Or lets go one step lower.

How many you know ,westereners, who can carry their rigpa around ,on leaving home,getting on the bus,reading on the bus,getting off the bus,taking the tube,reading on the tube getting off the tube,walking to office ,on the way to office saying hello to 50 individuals,spending 10 hours doing shit in a stupid f...d up office..leaving work.. etc....and so on...?

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN very recently said that he knows of students in the DC who have concrete knowledge of Dzogchen, good practitioners, this means they are very integrated.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 11th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He adresses this objection in his book early on.

viniketa said:

He also addresses objections based in 'postmodern' arguments early-on.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually I did not know about this author, but I read a substantial portion of his book "Being Different" last night, and I find that I broadly agree with his presentation of Dharmic culture as opposed to Judeo-Christian-Islamic culture. Many of his points are points I have made in the past in various places and to various people over the past 25 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 10th, 2012 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

tobes said:

I think it's a huge (and wrong, and bad) reification of 'western' epistemic/ hermeneutical frameworks.

Malcolm wrote:
He addresses this objection in his book early on.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 10th, 2012 at 10:19 PM
Title: Re: Iron Ornaments
Content:

Yudron said:
I'm having a new iron security fence built, and I have the opportunity to have an iron ornament fabricated and welded on to it--this is pretty common. I'm thinking a lotus motif, like a simple line drawing, might be nice. Has anyone out there done anything like that?

Malcolm wrote:
Vajras would be better.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 10:18 PM
Title: Re: Which Buddhist School is Right For Me?
Content:

My Socks Smell said:
I'm in Southwestern Virginia.

Malcolm wrote:
<https://www.ligmincha.org> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://www.tcbci.org/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And of course, because my master constantly gives webcasted retreats:

<http://www.tsegyalgar.org> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 10:09 PM
Title: Re: Does Zen/Chan Offer an Opinion Regarding Shentong/Rangtong?
Content:

Matylda said:
Rangtong and shentong have nothing to do with Indian Buddhism. Names and ideas are Tibetan... similarly there are no 4 or 6 tantra division in Japan, as there was no such division known in India.

Malcolm wrote:
Your first statement here is correct.

The second is false: there were such divisions in India -- it is found in such tantras as the Vajramala and so on, but they are post-eighth century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

Jax said:

However Bon does not have the cycle of Dungs'o Repa regarding the Seven Levels of Visions that are quite extraordinary. Norbu offers this transmission, and I have found the results from practice to be most profound. It is considered in Nyingma to be the pinnacle of esoteric methods. I recommend everyone to pursue this unique transmission. Norbu recently taught all seven levels at a public retreat.

spanda said:

Does anybody know when exactly has N. Norbu taught this transmission of Dungs'o Repa's Seven Levels of Visions?

Except for Longde teachings, Yangti (taught not in a complete form), and Thogal teachings, I don't know any other teaching similar with this, given by N. Norbu..

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has given the lung for this cycle teachings several times, for example, in 1992 in Conway. But he informed us then that we do the first level, then we communicate with him and based on our experience, he will communicate the next level and so on.

He gave the Longsal Yangti teaching last year in Merigar. It has the same basic structure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I am in the UK and it would be great to have a centre (Gar?) here.

Malcolm wrote:

Kunselling is there.

Blue Garuda said:

Yes, to clarify I meant a centre (as in permanent owned building) in the UK. Is there one?

EDIT: Just found it - wonderful!

Malcolm wrote:

<http://dzogchencommunity.org/kunselling/kunselling.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 9th, 2012 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I am in the UK and it would be great to have a centre (Gar?) here.

Malcolm wrote:

Kunselling is there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen

Content:

Jnana said:

You still fail to understand or acknowledge the point: There are people who are not receptive to dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, as the Dzogchen tantras openly acknowledge.

The job of the teacher is identify such persons and steer them to the appropriate spritual solution. *

M

rai said:

i am wondering how does it happen when teacher has many students and don't know me very well (at all)?

* the quote is from "Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations" thread but my question fits this discussion more i think.

Malcolm wrote:

A person like ChNN can size you up very quickly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

What I said was that even if they receive DI, they do not necessarily experience rigpa (in fact, my opinion is that most people don't). This shows they have limitations and have to work on them. How do they work on them? They apply teachings for other yantras. But they have to know about these yantras first before they can apply, hence the teachings of other yantras are important.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Actually, such people would most likely benefit much more by diligently practicing rushen and semdzins...

pueraeternus said:

Or they could also do the usual hundred thousand Vajrasattvas, mandala offerings, etc, and other myriad methods from the other yantras. Nothing wrong with that.

As mentioned before, my replies were in response to how the thread in the Dharma-free-for-all forum went, and my intention to correct those sentiments that I felt wasn't appropriate for a general dharma audience, or even for aspiring Dzogchen practitioners. Moving these posts here have shifted the context of that discussion. But in any case, this is also the general Dzogchen forum, so teachings from other Dzogchen masters who follow a more traditional method should be honored too.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with a traditional ngondro, but it is not essential. Rushen and semzin on the other hand, are essential.

Aspiring Dzogchen practitioners should find the best possible lineage. I really do not know of any other master alive today who had two direct masters who attained rainbow body. Do you? Of course there are other masters who have concrete knowledge of four visions and so on. So you get who you get based on your karma -- but in general, we do not have much time. Therefore, I always tell people who want to really understand Dzogchen that they should receive teachings from ChNN.

Then there are a class of people like yourself who have received teachings from ChNN but are actually following other teachers in reality. This is fine, this is good-- but there is generally a disconnect between what your teachers consider important for Dzogchen practice and what mine does. It comes out again and again in the endless and fruitless debate over ngondro. It is inevitable that if someone following more traditional teacher claims you have to ngondro, etc., someone who is following ChNN will disagree.

There is really no need to follow other yānas if you are a Dzogchen practitioner. Why? Because the sgra thal 'gyur tantra is the root of all Dharma. It is the first Dharma ever taught to sentient beings. Every other Dharma comes from it. All this talk about the

need to go step by step through all nine yānas is really a misconception forced on Dzogchen teachings by those who follow the system of Kamalashila and later, Atisha.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: The Pitfalls of Western analysis of "Dharmic Traditions"

Content:

catmoon said:

Might be good to start with Stephen Batchelor's "Buddhism Without Beliefs". He's not exactly trying to expunge karma and rebirth from Buddhism, and those looking for a classic anti-rebirth stance may be disappointed in his agnostic position, but he is a major figure on the scene. If there are "Pitfalls of Western Analysis of Dharmic Traditions", they should show up in his writings.

Malcolm wrote:

His explicit rejection of karma and rebirth happens in Confessions of a Buddhist Atheist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You should read the Longchen Nyinthing aspiration of basis, path and result.

tomamundsen said:

Is there an English translation of this? If so, can you point us in that direction?

Thanks!

Is it <http://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/nyingma-masters/jigme-lingpa/prayer-ground-path-and-fruition?>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen

Content:

username said:

- Finally it is wrong to say Rigpa is this or that, it is ineffable and has many manifestations, not just one.

<http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/Rigpa> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Vimalamitra defines five kinds of rig pa. These five more or less cover everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

Nice quote, but that is hardly everything I think.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

As far as people interested in Dzogchen goes, that passage is cited over and over again by many masters. There is another way to divide up capacities in 21 capacities. Apart from the best, the majority of the other capacities refer to when a person is liberated in the bardo, or if one is very average, in a nirmanakāya pure realm in one's next life.

Vimalamitra states in his commentary on the sgra thal 'rgyur tantra:

"...that person of extraordinary diligence will attain buddhahood in this life with the contaminated body disappearing. Even the average person, after taking spontaneous birth in a natural nirmanakāya buddhafiield, will find solace from that and attain buddhahood. Therefore, merely by entering into this teaching of the definitive great secret one will not enter into the three realms."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

If the introduction failed, they can't go on to the 2nd statement "Do not remain in doubt". Hence at this point they have to work with their situation and limitations so that they may be successful the next time.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you have missed a critical point. If they did not recognize their real nature from the direct introduction they must move to the second statement. This is the purpose of the methods of semzin and rushan. See page 29 of the SOV book.

Otherwise, if they definitely recognized their real nature through the direct introduction, then they can skip that and go to the third statement, continue in that state. But such people are very rare. So, the second statement means you confirm the experience of the direct introduction by using many methods, whatever it takes, whatever works for your condition best.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Real Bodhisattva path really starts with the 1st Bhumi as an arya - the others are just aspiring Bodhisattvas.

Malcolm wrote:

This is also false. The true bodhisattva path starts with the path of accumulation i.e. sambharamarga. This is why it is stated quite clearly that a beginning bodhisattva who has just given rise to supreme bodhicitta on the path of accumulation is much superior to an Arhat.

Basically, every path starts with its mode of entry -- for Hināyāna it is taking a vow. For Mahāyāna it creating bodhicitta. For Vajrayāna it is taking an initiation. For Dzogchen it is receiving direct introduction.

You do not have to receive all these other rites of vows and so on however to enter into Dzogchen teachings. It is completely unnecessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Real Dzogchen, as has been pointed out infinite times, starts with direct introduction, and that is all.

pueraeternus said:

Doesn't Real Dzogchen start with rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it starts with direct introduction. Thus, we have the first of Garab Dorje's three statements.

If Dzogchen started with rigpa, it would be impossible for people who are ignorant to be introduced to their own nature. But because it is possible to introduce people to that nature, Dzogchen starts with direct introduction.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But if you start insisting people must conform to your limitations, I will point out that this is not so.

M

pueraeternus said:

I have not insisted others to conform to anything. I merely pointed out that (a) most of us have a lot of limitations, (b) we should be honest and aware of it as much as we can, (c) please don't diss the lower yanas, since they are precious in helping us overcome limitations.

Malcolm wrote:

On the contrary, you have insisted most assiduously that people cannot practice Dzogchen even if they have received direct introduction. This is a completely misguided idea. In Dzogchen teachings we discover our limitations so we can go beyond them-- we do not decide to remain in our limitations.

I have not even mentioned other yānas apart from correcting your perception of the purpose of the SMS base level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Such sentiments do not accord with the teachings of Dzogchen themselves at all.

pueraeternus said:

It accords with the way other teachers of Dzogchen transmit it.

Malcolm wrote:

What so called "teachers of Dzogchen" teach is not necessarily Dzogchen at all. For this

reason, I will stick what what the Dzogchen teachings actually say rather than what some teachers of "Dzogchen" say. You however are free to disagree and follow whomever you please. But if you start insisting people must conform to your limitations, I will point out that this is not so.

What I am talking about is the path of Dzogchen. We don't need to take one road, and then another road, and then finally we can be on the road of Dzogchen. If this were the case, then Dzogchen would not be a Yāna.

That is not the principle of Dzogchen teachings at all. You should read the Longchen Nyinthig aspiration of basis, path and result. Then you will understand more clearly. Otherwise, this conversation has become useless since you are merely crowing the party line of some Nyingmapas.

If people are interested in following Dzogchen teachings, then they should make an effort to meet Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Of course there are other teachers who give very nice teachings of Dzogchen as well. But in general this Lamrim style approach to Dzogchen really has very little to with actual Dzogchen.

Real Dzogchen, as has been pointed out infinite times, starts with direct introduction, and that is all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Capacity for following Dzogchen

Content:

heart said:

I have understood that the qualities of the Dzogchen practitioners are mentioned quite clearly in the Dzogchen Tantra's themselves. Malcolm, perhaps you could sum up the most important points? Personally I think that before meeting Dzogchen my studies of Dharma made less sense. Everything in sutra and tantra make sense in the light of Dzogchen, but this is perhaps not the experience of everyone in this forum.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Listen well to my demonstration of the sublime method! There is no increase or decrease in true wisdom. There is no clarity or lack of clarity in the appearances of wisdom. There is no near or far on the path of secret mantra. There is no greater or smaller in the self-appearing. There is no sharp or dull in the capacity of sentient beings.

-- Rig pa rang drol

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 12:26 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Pero said:

That's why you go on a retreat.

Malcolm wrote:

This is primarily directed to Pero:

In 2002, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu told me personally and privately that by doing six days of retreat on Khandroling you can realize what would take six months in other places. I then related this to other people. It is true.

ChNN has also said many times his students never need to do more than three months of retreat at a time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 8th, 2012 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

I would say that the majority are of the latter. And for them to have a chance to discover that potentiality, they have to plough the field first, and even then, the seed might not sprout in this life.

Malcolm wrote:

Such sentiments do not accord with the teachings of Dzogchen themselves at all.

pueraeternus said:

I think a lot of Dzogchen practitioners really only have a conceptual knowledge of their potential. The real danger for them is that they mistaken it for true rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

You would better off being concerned with your own rigpa, and not that of others. In particular you should be careful not to discourage those people interested in entering Dzogchen teachings by insisting they should follow sutra or tantra first.

If you have discovered a limitation in yourself, then that is fine. You should try to improve

your own capacity -- but judging the capacities of others to be low and insisting upon it to them is a very damaging mistake that can really have negative impact for yourself and those who listen to you. If you block the path of others, in the future, your own path will be blocked.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Yes, but that assumes that the students have a great deal of self-awareness and reflection. If students were really honest with themselves, then a lot of them would come to a realization there is so much work they have to do that they might as well do a form of assembly line approach.

Malcolm wrote:

We do not share the same perspective.

pueraeternus said:

Already, merely by entering Dzogchen teachings you have proved you are of very high capacity. If not, you never will ever hear even one word of Dzogchen teachings. This point is made again and again in Dzogchen tantras, and also by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and other masters.

Then everyone in DW is of very high capacity?

Malcolm wrote:

Entering means receiving direct introduction. Not merely hearing about the teachings intellectually, such as on a forum such as this. But even to hear the word Dzogchen intellectually proves one has a connection with the teachings.

pueraeternus said:

Therefore, this point of view that many people primulgate "I am interested in Dzoghen but I do not have sufficient capacity to study and practice Dzogchen" or "Dzogchen is so profound, there is no way it can be practiced unless you have studied and practiced sutra and tantra for many years" is completely wrong, I am very sorry to say. How many really have the experience of rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Many people following Dzogchen teachings have concrete knowledge [rigpa] of their primordial potentiality, including some people who post on this forum. The rest of the people following Dzogchen teachings are actively trying to discover that potentiality so they can be in that knowledge.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

ChNN leaves it to his students to observe themselves and apply methods accordingly...

Malcolm wrote:

This is the key point: the standard assembly line approach advocated by the monastic system insists that everyone must move ahead, step by step, mastering one thing before moving onto the next thing. But this is not the approach of Dzogchen teachings at all. The approach of Dzogchen teachings is that you receive transmission and then discover for yourself what you need, and that is all. You do not need to study anything intellectually at all.

Already, merely by entering Dzogchen teachings you have proved you are of very high capacity. If not, you never will ever hear even one word of Dzogchen teachings. This point is made again and again in Dzogchen tantras, and also by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and other masters.

Therefore, this point of view that many people promulgate "I am interested in Dzogchen but I do not have sufficient capacity to study and practice Dzogchen" or "Dzogchen is so profound, there is no way it can be practiced unless you have studied and practiced sutra and tantra for many years" is completely wrong, I am very sorry to say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Why do you think he created the Santi Maha Sangha?

Malcolm wrote:

To preserve Dzogchen teachings by training people in a more detailed fashion. BTW, Santi Maha Sangha is Odḍiyāna language for "Dzogchen Community" (rdzog chen 'dus sde).

M

pueraeternus said:

Yes, but the Base is also full of sutric and tantric teachings. With that, its easier for the trainee to proceed to Semde, Longde and Mennagde.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis of SMS follows Padmasambhava's Man ngag lta ba phreng ba. As such, its main POV is a little connected with Mahāyoga, in my opinion. However, ChNN never claims that one needs to follow the Base in order to follow Dzogchen teachings. These are provided not as a step by step formula, but in order for the practitioner to make use of whatever teachings he or she needs, and also to gain a little experience in all the different sort of practices one can do. For this reason then, the basis contains practices from Hinayāna, Mahāyāna, Mahāyoga, Anuyoga, Semde and Managde -- but the main point throughout is how we integrate Dzogchen teachings into our whole life. Actually, for a Dzogchen practitioner, conduct, or attitude, as ChNN translates spyod pa, is arguably the most important aspect of one's practice. How do we know our pratice is moving ahead? Through our conduct. Our conduct or attitude is where we discover our level of integration. Do we have more tension? More problems? Then our integration is not good, and our attitude needs adjustment. Are we having less tension and less problems? Then our integration is improving, and our attitude is becoming better and better.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

But it's a good point. How many realized beings are there in the world? Who is becoming realized in the West? How many have become enlightened in the last ten years? Twenty years? Fifty? The last century?

Malcolm wrote:

I can think of at least five people within the past 15 years who acheived total realization -- two bonpo in Tibet, a couple of buddhist yogis in repkong, Khenpo Acho is famous. I am sure there are more.

underthetree said:

It gave me pause to read the recent thread on Buddhist saints. Every candidate was from the Middle Ages at the very latest.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah...there are plenty of saints, enough to go around for everyone, even in this century, Buddhist, Bonpo and Hindu -- even Christian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

pueraeternus said:

Why do you think he created the Santi Maha Sangha?

Malcolm wrote:

To preserve Dzogchen teachings by training people in a more detailed fashion. BTW, Santi Maha Sangha is Oḍḍiyāna language for "Dzogchen Community" (rdzog chen 'dus sde).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

JKhedrup said:

If Gampopa had not studied with the Kadampa teachers as well as Milarepa, would he have produced his magnum opus "Jewel Ornament of Liberation".

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone forgets that Gampopa was a Nyingmapa to begin with, and that Nyingma remained influential on him all his life.

pueraeternus said:

Do you have a source for this?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, his biography.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 7th, 2012 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

Spiritual practice and study becomes extremely difficult in such circumstances.

Worldly pleasures and pursuits are more appealing than Dharma quite often.

Malcolm wrote:

This is simply because people do not have teachers that teach them how to integrate. Frankly, most of the so-called Buddhists I have met are very non-integrated people. After years of so called Dharma practice they just do not have their shit together, and they cannot manifest what they need.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You have to eat. You have to have clothes. You have to have shelter.

That means you have to make money. This is how it is in our world. We cannot go begging door to door. This is not realistic.

Everyone must have a job.

M

Huseng said:

Of course. Though it is possible to set aside sufficient funds to go practice for extended periods and then come back to the ordinary world. If I'm not mistaken you went on extended three year retreat in the past, right? Clearly you came back alive and well.

Malcolm wrote:

I did a three year retreat. It was valuable. I had a hard time adjusting however, and most people do, when they get out.

Huseng said:

However in the west a guy leaving his wife and kids behind to do a three year retreat is probably going to be called a deadbeat. Maybe we can't avoid that.

Malcolm wrote:

He is a deadbeat, unless his wife and kids are on board with it in a positive sense. The Buddha clearly never intended that people abandon their families.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm, is that the New Age Invasion, or the Dharma Police Lynch Mob?

Malcolm wrote:

Lynch mob.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

Serious practice is usually not done by family men or women. Let's be realistic and honest.

Malcolm wrote:

Serious practice is not usually done by anybody, including people in long retreats. Let's be realistic and honest.

It has nothing to do with whether one is in retreat, or is a farmer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

With the greatest respect, Huseng, may you never have to deal with the consequences when someone you know decides to 'just leave their family.' What 'immeasurable opportunities' could be opened up by an act of such monstrous selfishness?

Huseng said:

When I did it I didn't think it was monstrously selfish.

Malcolm wrote:

I think he meant wife and kids. Did you leave a wife and kid behind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

Renunciation doesn't mean departing from worthwhile friends (kalyāṇa-mitra), though generally speaking mundane affairs and a lot of social engagements take people away from spiritual cultivation and practice. The Buddha himself was keen on the value of likeminded friends, though he cautioned everyone about mundane attachments and strong social ties and duties. This is what I have in mind at the moment.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to eat. You have to have clothes. You have to have shelter.

That means you have to make money. This is how it is in our world. We cannot go begging door to door. This is not realistic.

Everyone must have a job.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

In the future having a life partner might make a lot of sense economically for example...

Malcolm wrote:

Sigh.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

I don't quite understand what your last statement means.

Malcolm wrote:

There are a lot of so called "renunciates", monks and nun, out there whose so called "renunication" is just bitterness, disappointment, grudges.

It is much better to have an open heart.

Human beings are meant to be in communities with one another. This is why the Buddha said that friendship is the whole of the so called "spritual life". The idea that we are somehow better off in isolation is a fundamental error that comes about from not understanding who we are. Of course there are some people who can be like Mahākashyapa, but he was by all accounts a pretty crusty character.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Huseng said:

Such freedom when I think about it is a lot more satisfying and worthwhile than being in a long-term relationship (which I've had)..

Malcolm wrote:

Um....no offense, but you are twenty-six, you have not lived long enough enough to be in a real longterm relationship. Younger men such as yourself often make bold declarations about how they are going to be in the future.

Reality is much different, and you have no idea how your karma will ripen.

An open heart beats all this fabricated talk about renunciation, everyday.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Practiced distinterest is better than shrill denunciations.

M

catmoon said:

"All that is required for evil to prosper is that good men do nothing."

Malcolm wrote:

That might be true of the Third Reich, but it hardly applies to the "new ager question".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

For all the lip-service to the Goddess and the feminine, Buddhism, like the New Age, can be quite startlingly chauvinistic. I find that my distaste for this fact - as a man as well as a practitioner - is one of the main things that keeps me at arms' distance from sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

While the Dharma, in its essence is not patriarchal, Buddhism is a very patriarchal religion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: Tryodashang Guggul

Content:

Virgo said:

I just noticed recently that I have a bunch of this in the house that I ordered a couple of years ago from India, but for some reason never took at that time (it is still within date). Normally, I don't take medicines as I was told to straighten out problems by way of diet and lifestyle first, which I have; however with the recent job change and schedule change it might be good to take for a while. This is good for vata, only thing is I can't take anything that is too warming. any idea if this stuff is too warming for me?

Thanks.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Should be fine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

JKhedrup said:

If Gampopa had not studied with the Kadampa teachers as well as Milarepa, would he have produced his magnum opus "Jewel Ornament of Liberation".

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone forgets that Gampopa was a Nyingmapa to begin with, and that Nyingma remained influential on him all his life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Nemo said:

It's very realistic when you are young and have no ties. Even a crusty bastard like me has taken a few years out of his life for retreat. Admitting that your need for comfort and security is greater than your spiritual aspirations is more honest than saying it is an escapist dream. People love money and worldly life more than Dharma. It sounds like you are trying to comfort yourself by thinking everyone has your low standards.

Malcolm wrote:

Everyone has to discover their limitations and practice withing those. When you know what your limitations are, then liberation is very possible, even if you like money, comfort and security.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 6th, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

KeithBC said:

Threads that are not worth paying attention to (by Buddhists) will be kept alive by the New Agers who outnumber us.

Malcolm wrote:

so called Newagers do not outnumber Buddhists on this board.

Disinterest always works -- if you don't find something interesting, don't read it, and if you do, don't respond.

I do not respond to 98+ percent of posts made in this forum. I am unlikely to respond to anymore posts in this thread, now that I have made my opinion known, for whatever it is worth.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Hiding "Dharma treasures" for future generations to find

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need for this.

The sublime Dharma arises from the intrinsic sound of Dharmatā. That is always present, just as awakened beings are always present to communicate it. Hence, the treasure tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: The board and its direction (if any)

Content:

catmoon said:

Perhaps we should look at whether or not there is some basic Dharma, like the 4NT and 8FP, that can be realistically defended by mods.

Malcolm wrote:

What you do not want to do is go in the direction of E-Sangha. Our motivation was good, but the bureaucratic heavy-handedness backfired and created more problems than it solved.

People's speculations will wear out if no one expresses interest in them. Threads that are not worth paying attention to will die.

Practiced disinterest is better than shrill denunciations.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Throma Nagmo Teachings by Lama Tharchin Rinpoche

Content:

Pero said:

Cool, thanks! I browsed around their website a bit and it seems this particular teaching

will be about a short sadhana of Troma Nagmo. Do you or anyone else know if there will be recitation commitments or something?

Malcolm wrote:

I think you need the Wang to attend

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:

deepbluehum said:

My apologies:

So Malcolm, what's so special about this text that makes it useful vis a vis the Kosha? .

Malcolm wrote:

It is directly connected with Dzogchen practice.

Even if you take the position it is a pseudographia, it was produced by a realized Dzogchen master, Shenchén Luga, etc. So the teachings of Dzogchen permeate it.

It has interesting and detailed accounts of the dharmadhātu, wisdoms, etc.

deepbluehum said:

This has really nothing to do with the Kosha. The issue becomes how is the Mdzog phug an interesting text vis a vis Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

The Mdzog phug itself really has nothing to do with the Kosha, apart from cribbing a few passages here and there (which Buddhists make a big fuss about, at the expense of the rest of the text).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

Caz said:

I appreciate they may reinforce one and other but how is it necessary to study Lamdre in order to improve your understanding of Guhyasamaja or Dzogchen, Surely if one accomplishes the results of one perfect clarity and understanding will come naturally regarding the rest ?

Malcolm wrote:

Such accomplishment is rare. Studying all teachings impartially improves our chances

for realization because it improves our prajñā.

Further, we never know what circumstances we will be born in. If we are familiar with all teachings, and make a connection with all teachings, then we have more opportunity and it will be easier to study and practice in the future. For example, even if we want to be a Kagyu in life after life there is no guarantee.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: A directive for a non-sectarian approach to practice (HHDL)

Content:

JKhedrup said:

HH the Dalai Lama Dharamsala Lam Rim Commentary 1998

Therefore Kagyupas must know the Mahamudra teaching in Sakya. The Sakyapas must know Dzogchen, they must know Kagyu. The Gelugpas must know Dzogchen, they must know Sakya and Kagyu. Such knowledge should not be learned merely for scholarship but for the sake of one's practice.

For the sake of one's practice one should receive important empowerments, get important transmissions and in this way on the one hand you will get some idea and knowledge, and at the same time be able to gain more understanding.

In my own experience, with regards to understanding the meaning of clear light as explained in the Guyyasamaja, I was able to get much inspiration from my study and understanding of Dzogchen. Likewise, certain teachings in the Gelugpa tradition, such as the explanation of the three voidnesses, such kind of understanding will be very helpful in understanding the Dzogchen or Nyingma tradition.

Caz said:

It sounds like he is saying that these lineages are not complete in of their selves unless it is a mistranslation, To be Non sectarian does one have to mix lineages or just respect them as equals ?

Malcolm wrote:

What he is saying is that all teachings reinforce one another, that one's understanding of Dzogchen, for example will be improved by studying Lamdre and Guhyasamaja, One's understanding of Mahamudra will be improved by studying Dzogchen and Lamdre, one's understanding of Lamdre will be improved by studying Dzogchen and Mahamudra, etc.

I think he is mostly talking to lineage heads.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 5th, 2012 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Throma Nagmo Teachings by Lama Tharchin Rinpoche

Content:

Pero said:

Can you say a bit more about this teaching? Throma Nagmo is a wrathful deity and related to Chod practice?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a major cycle from Dudjom Lingpa -- it has chod as an important part of the practice, but it is a cycle of Dzogchen teachings very much connected with Anuyoga, which has complete tregcho and thoga instructions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 4th, 2012 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:

ratna said:

I studied one chapter of it recently, the chapter on the five elements with Dranpa Namkhai's commentary, and found it to be an amazing text of much interest, much more interesting in many respects than Vasubandhu's Kosha for someone who is practicing Dzogchen.

I'd appreciate if you elaborated on this.

BTW, could you give a TBRC reference for the commentary?

R

Malcolm wrote:

The basic verses and the commentary were published by LTN in 1966. I have an original copy of that which is miraculously still in one piece.

The tbrc number for a later commentary is W23426.

Unfortunately LTN's edition Mdzod Phug: Basic Verses is not available through TBRC. I am just lucky to have acquired a copy from Saujanya books in India some years ago.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 4th, 2012 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:
deepbluehum said:
My apologies:

So Malcolm, what's so special about this text that makes it useful vis a vis the Kosha? .

Malcolm wrote:
It is directly connected with Dzogchen practice.

Even if you take the position it is a pseudographia, it was produced by a realized Dzogchen master, Shenchen Luga, etc. So the teachings of Dzogchen permeate it.

It has interesting and detailed accounts of the dharmadhātu, wisdoms, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 4th, 2012 at 9:12 PM
Title: Re: What makes one a Mahayanist?
Content:
Kunga said:
I was thinking earlier, exactly what does one have to accept in order to be a Mahayanist.

Malcolm wrote:
One has to generate supreme bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 10:30 PM
Title: Re: The Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra = Yogācārabhūmi ?
Content:
Jnana said:
Well, the Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript by Wayman leaves quite a bit untranslated (and what is translated could be done better). The Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra covers much of the same ideas as the Bodhisattvabhūmi but the content isn't exactly the same.

Malcolm wrote:
The Yogacarabhumi can be roughly considered to be a systematic grand commentary on the Mahāyāna Sūtra Ālaṃkāra, and the five treatises of Maitrya in general.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 9:48 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
seraphim said:

Hi all, so the Donwang we got today is actually Shitro Khorde Rangdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The text is often incorrectly dismissed as a copy of the Buddhist Abhidharmakosha but it is nothing of the sort.

deepbluehum said:

It lifts entire passages wholesale.

Malcolm wrote:

Dan Martin analyzed the whole text. You need to read this if you are interested:

Comparing Treasuries: Mental states and Mdzod phug lists and passages with parallels in Abhidharma works by Vasubandhu and Asanga, or in Prajñāpāramitra sūtras: A progress report

http://ir.minpaku.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10502/1286/1/SER15_004.pdf "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

There was no Dzogchen at the time of Vasubhandu.

That merely serves to show how interesting the Mdzod phug is.

Incidentally, I made an error, the commentary of the Mdzod phug was produced about a century later.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Vasubandhu Pure Land site

Content:

Jikan said:

Related question that Malcolm is particularly well positioned to address:

in the volume Heart Drops of Dharmakaya, it's claimed that Vasubhandu's cosmology shares a common origin with Bonpo teachings. Is this a plausible claim? If so, does it contradict the claim that it derives from the Sarvastivada school? Or does it follow that the Bonpo tradition may share a common origin with the Sarvastivada school also?

Malcolm wrote:

see <https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=78&t=9553> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Tadyatha

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Thank you both.

So, grammatically, does the tadyatha signify that the praise is made by means of the mantra? i.e., "Praise to so and so - [make the praise] like this: Om. . . "

Malcolm wrote:

Tadyatha is made of two words tad yatha, "as follows here":

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Mdzog Phug and the Kosha

Content:

Jikan said:

Related question that Malcolm is particularly well positioned to address:

in the volume Heart Drops of Dharmakaya, it's claimed that Vasubhandu's cosmology shares a common origin with Bonpo teachings. Is this a plausible claim? If so, does it contradict the claim that it derives from the Sarvastivada school? Or does it follow that the Bonpo tradition may share a common origin with the Sarvastivada school also?

Malcolm wrote:

This is because the so called Bonpo Abhidharma, the Srid pa'i Mdzod Phug (revealed and written down by Shenchen Luga

<http://www.thlib.org/?wiki=/access/wiki/site/679c2e7e-ca49-462b-0038-a5e0534b709f/biography%20of%20shenchen%20luga.html> (996-1035) in 1017) is held by the Bonpos to have been taught by Tonpa Shenrab. Tonpa Shenrab lived much earlier than Vasubandhu and the Buddha. There are some passages in the mDzod phug that are shared with the Kosha, but not very many, actually. But the Meru Cosmology etc., is basically the same. Therefore, the Bonpos claim the Mdzod phug influenced Buddhist cosmology.

Most modern scholars believe that the Mdzod Phug was partially influenced by the Kosha. However, the Mdzod Phug has a great deal of material in it that indicates it was also highly influenced by Dzogchen and so on. The materials in it are rich and have not been studied very much. The text is often incorrectly dismissed as a copy of the Buddhist Abhidharmakosha but it is nothing of the sort.

I studied one chapter of it recently, the chapter on the five elements with Dranpa Namkhai's commentary, and found it to be an amazing text of much interest, much more interesting in many respects than Vasubandhu's Kosha for someone who is practicing Dzogchen.

Dan Martin has done a lot of interesting analysis of the root text, but not so much on the commentary. Both texts, the root and the commentary were produced/revealed at the same time, in 1017.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Question about rainbow bodies

Content:

Fa Dao said:

heres a thought...

after a person has achieved rainbow body is it possible for them to physically incarnate again? or do they stay that way indefinitely?

heart said:

Chetsun Senghe Wangchuk attained rainbow body and was later born as Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo, who then reveled the Chetsun Nyingthig.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

JKW was an emanation, not a reincarnation, technically speaking.

Likewise, Vimalamitra is supposed to manifest an emanation every one hundred years or so. My teacher, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa was an emantion of Vimalamitra, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 3rd, 2012 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Tadyatha

Content:

dakini_boi said:

namo bhagavate bhaiṣajyaguru

vaiḍūryaprabharājāya tathāgatāya

arhate samyaksambuddhāya tadyathā:

oṃ bhaiṣajye bhaiṣajye mahābhaiṣajya-samudgate svāhā

Malcolm wrote:

Right, the first part is a praise, "Homage to the Bhagavan Bhaisajjaraguru Vaiduryaprabharaja, a tathagata, an arhat, a samyaksambuddha", followed by his mantra, thus, om....etc.

but typically we recite all together.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Vasubandhu Pure Land site

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

I have so a question:

- Maybe could you help me to find the kosmological interpretations of Vasubandhu

Malcolm wrote:

Chapter three of the Abhidharmakoshabhasyam.

kalden yungdrung said:

and maybe is it also explainable why his vision differs greatly from the Vajrayana opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't really. Kalacakra cosmology is unique -- but otherwise the model of the Meru cosmology used in Vasubandhu's presentation as the defacto cosmology used in Indian and Tibetan Vajrayāna accounts.

The origin of Vasubandhu's cosmology is the the Sarvastivada school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation

Content:

Will said:

They are the same thing

Malcolm wrote:

They are not the thing. One who is free of grasping and attachment has no need renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jikan said:

“Man-ngag Tag-drol Gyud”

a precious Terma teaching of Rigdzin Jangchub Dorje

would someone please describe this teaching briefly? eg does it go by a particular title in English? thanks

Malcolm wrote:

The Tantra of the Liberation Through Wearing Intimate Instruction.

This is a tantra about these complicated and important tagdrols, how to make them, how to use them, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation

Content:

Will said:

then renunciation or non-attachment will be occurring.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not the same thing.

For example, a renunciate who has given up sexual activity may still be attached to sexual activity. A non-renunciate may be no attachment to sexual activity.

But there are different paths for different people of different dispositions, this is why we talk about the path of renunciation, transformation, and self-liberation. The essence of the last path is freedom from grasping, but not renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 2nd, 2012 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Appropriate relationship with Guru

Content:

heart said:

You might have some doubts about his/her knowledge of Danish cheeses or politics in Austria but it isn't proper to doubt his/her knowledge and realization of the natural state.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, because if you do, that person should not be your guru and you should cease taking teachings from them immediately.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Drug relapse leads to broken Samaya?

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

Also, do you know of any practice within Dzogchen or Tibetan medicine that is good for addictions. I am thinking specifically for protection against negative influences. It is said that environment is stronger than will. I am deeply involved with my practice but I am very isolated from my teachers and sangha. I work as a cook in busy restaurants where drug and alcohol use is rampant. In one sense this provides me with opportunities for postmeditation practices, but I have always fallen prey to the influence of those around me. I do pretty good, but man it certainly is not easy! I feel like I am living a double life, most people don't know that I am a practitioner, even though it's been a huge part of my life for nearly ten years. I would really like to say that I will never relapse again, but like I said, it's not easy, especially when drugs are literally in my face. This is where a lot of the doubt comes from, because I have failed so many times in the past. Drugs really screwed me up, I still feel their effects years later and I am sure that I have yet to pay the full price of my mistakes.

So I am thinking protection and purification practices. I have also been doing purification of the five elements. I'll probably order some Agar 35, maybe it will help me to relax and trust myself some.

Thanks,
Troy

Malcolm wrote:

You should write to ChNN and ask him for a Dorje Gotrab amulet.

You should recite a lot of purification of five element mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Drug relapse leads to broken Samaya?

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

So this has been an important year for me. If something is transmitted, or brought forth

during an empowerment, is it possible for me to lose that through negative actions?

Malcolm wrote:

Your primordial state cannot be broken, nor can it be improved.

Keeping samaya means being interested in your path. Breaking samaya means ceasing to care about your path.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For Ipad users try:

Photon Flash Player Browser

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For Ipad users try:

iSwifter Flash Browser.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 1st, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm: Renunciation is not a cause for liberation.

Baloney. Virtually every other spiritual tradition agrees with Buddha, that non-attachment or renunciation is a critical element on the path to liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-attachment aka freedom from grasping on the one hand, and renunciation on the other are very different.

The former is liberation; the latter is not, and does not necessarily lead to the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation is a low-hanging fruit, you only need to pick it -- but you have to have a guide who can show you where that fruit is.

You don't need to give up anything to attain liberation.

Huseng said:

The Buddha suggested otherwise: renunciation.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on which of the Buddha's teachings you wish to consider definitive.

Renunciation is not a cause for liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

underthetree said:

But you're right. There's hardly any way to be calm any more, for any length of time, in our world.

Huseng said:

It will get worse, especially as economic contraction takes its toll on the "developed world". Being kaliyuga there are a lot of events, both physical and occult, that are progressively making ordinary existence in this world harder and harder in both obvious and subtle ways. Demonic forces are becoming stronger as time goes on as well.

I think figures like Ajahn Brahm are worth considering. He's definitely an adept and highly attained yogi.

However, the lot of us sit on our arses worrying about our financial future and careers, so we're not really willing to give it all up for liberation. Perhaps doubt prevents many of us from doing it. The doubt that perhaps liberation isn't really possible, so you might as well play it safe by only going half-way while living the ordinary prescribed lifestyle.

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation is a low-hanging fruit, you only need to pick it -- but you have to have a guide who can show you where that fruit is.

You don't need to give up anything to attain liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: The Buddhism trend in decline.

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I also know that there are western practitioners who have genuine realization, but they are somewhat undervalued.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by realization.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's definition is very stringent. If you can place your hand in fire without it being harmed, then he will consider you realized. Since he himself cannot do this, he does not consider himself realized, just a little more experienced than we, his students.

I personally believe he is an arya, someone who is actually an awakened person -- but that is just me.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

tobes said:

If anyone is interested in a devastating refutation of this strange strawman distinction - that there are coherent and unified things called 'western' and 'Islamic' civilisations - please pm me, and I'll attach the scholarly article.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, there isn't. There is just an economic struggle happening, and different ideological groups seeking to control resources for their own propagation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Advice by Lunations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It goes by the four or six seasons. The end of a lunar month is considered the new moon, not the full moon.

Virgo said:

Thanks for the correction, Malcolm. In Tibetan Astrology is the full moon considered a time when things (projects, ideas, and so forth) come to a certain culmination? (I know it is in Vedic and Western) If so, as a Menpa would you think that is a way to mark time (so to speak), in a way, of when doshas are effected on a more minute level than on a seasonal level (even though of course it is a gradual process, happening moment to moment)? I would just like your thoughts on this, please.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

The full moon represents the end of the monthly cycle of flourishing which begins with the cycle of the waxing moon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Advice by Lunations

Content:

Virgo said:

A calander year contains either three or four seasons, depending on how the seasons are split up or reckoned. Whether it is reckoned as three or four seasons, a calander year still consist of twelve complete lunations or moon cycles. Sometimes (every 2 - 3 years), there is an additional moon cycle in a calander year, because the length of lunations varies depending on how close the moon is to the earth at any given time at which it cycles, as well as other reasons.

I know that advice is given in Tibetan Medicine for diet and lifestyle by season. The reason being that certain elements are dominant during certain seasons and this can disturb humours, effect digestion, etc.-- we accumulate certain things more at certain times. However, I also know that ancient people marked time by lunar phases. Specifically, the full moon (the end of a lunation) is the time where things come to completion. So, I was wondering if there is any extant advice for diet, behavior, cleanses etc., taught by lunations, that is to say for each of the individual 12 moon cycles in a calander year (whether over 3 or 4 seasons).

Thanks,

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

It goes by the four or six seasons. The end of a lunar month is considered the new moon, not the full moon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 31st, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Bon Phurpa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of interest as well:

<http://blogs.orient.ox.ac.uk/kila/2012/04/27/the-great-khu-tsha-zla-od/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Different Taras

Content:

Konchog1 said:

BUT, then why are there separate empowerments and mantras for White Tara and Kurukulle?

Malcolm wrote:

Different lineages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: psychedelics and visions

Content:

Nighthawk said:

How important and widespread is the use of psychedelics such as datura in order to have visions of Vajrayoginis, Dakinis, Taras etc. amongst Vajrayana masters and practitioners? Are these visions to be seen as genuine spiritual experiences or just mere hallucinations of the mind on drugs? I would love to hear your opinions on this matter.

Malcolm wrote:

In general there is no use of hallucinogens in Varjayāna. Even in the case of certain exceptions, these usages are no longer current i.e. they are not part of the living tradition. Where they were used, hallucinogens served only to demonstrate that the mind was not a fixed substance.

People who have used hallucinogens can understand their experiences with this in this respect. Garab Dorje clearly states in one commentary that hallucinogens merely generate worldly visions. So from a Vajrayāna perspective, hallucinogens do not have much, if any, spiritual value.

That being said, this is not to deny the value of the spiritual traditions of Huichol Indians, or Ayahuasca shamans who commune with plant spirits, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

My understanding is that as both are forms of Dark Blue Garuda from the same terma, the donwang for one of them grants permission for the practice of both, together with the medicinal practices and mantras.

Malcolm wrote:

They are separate empowerments completely, albeit from the same overall cycle of teachings.

Rinpoche has regularly been giving the lung main mantra for Khyung nag since last year.

Retreat on either form of garuda, or even having completed the three roots recitation, is sufficient for reciting the action mantras, etc.

Blue Garuda said:

Thanks for the clarification.

If you have attended the recent retreat on Takhyung Kilaya and have the lung for Khyung nag main mantra then you can use both main mantras ?

Malcolm wrote:

You can use either, as you wish. The sngags 'bum actually contains the root mantra of the Lama Zabdon cycle, which is not connected with either of these deities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 10:22 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Yangtso, how do you explain the Merotic (as opposed to Nilotic) features of many ancient depictions of Buddhas around the world?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha statues in Cambodia show Cambodian features. Some black nationalists have decided this proved Buddha was a negro. It is a very silly idea.

Anyone who has studied the history of Buddhist statuary knows there are two sculptural traditions of Buddha statues, Gandharan and Mathuran. The Mathuran tradition is a little later, and is the ancestor of all Theravadin traditions of Buddhist statuary. The Gandharan tradition is the prototype for all Chinese and Mahayāna traditions.

Cambodians are Australasiatics, and their art reflects their ethnicity.

But Negros do not universally have flat faces, thick lips and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

"The religion of Buddha, of India, is well known to have been very ancient. In the most ancient temples scattered throughout Asia, where his worship is yet continued, he is found black as jet, with the flat face, thick lips, and curly hair of the Negro."

"Stonehenge...temple of the black, curly-headed Buddha." - Master Mason Godfrey Higgins

Malcolm wrote:

This citation is obvious nonsense, and racist to boot.

The Masons don't know shit about Buddhadharma, whatever other "mysteries" they may claim to know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What HH Dalai Lama and Berzin are quoted as saying is factually incorrect. Vasubandhu says nothing about homosexuality per se.

Lhug-Pa said:

Well I actually meant to refer to the behavior itself, and not necessarily the 'orientation' alone.

Although, I'm quite sure that H.H. the Dalai Lama never implied that masturbation is not sexual misconduct for non-monks.

Also, from Berzin-Archives:

Alexander Berzin said:

Since both Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism base their practice of ethical self-discipline on Vasubandhu's texts, their lineages still include homosexuality in their lists of inappropriate sexual behavior.

Lhug-Pa said:

And:

H.H. the Dalai Lama said:

It's part of what we Buddhists call 'bad sexual conduct.' Sexual organs were created for reproduction between the male element and the female element and everything that deviates from that is not acceptable from a Buddhist point of view. Between a man and man, a woman and another woman, in the mouth, the anus, or even using a hand.

Lhug-Pa said:

"Reproduction" here can also refer to the Spiritual Reproduction or Regeneration that results from Karmamudra practice, not only physically making children; otherwise H.H. the Dalai Lama would not teach about Karmamudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Why would H.H. the Dalai Lama, as a Dzogchenpa, say that homosexuality is sexual misconduct if it were not?

Malcolm wrote:

He never said such a thing.

He merely stated that using certain orifices is sexual misconduct. Masturbation, he stated, was sexual misconduct only for monks.

There is no teaching anywhere, in any vinaya pitika, sutra or tantra, that states that

homosexuality i.e. same sex gender orientation, is "sexual misconduct".

You need to learn the distinction between gender orientation and sexual activity.

According to the traditional teachings anal or oral sex (ears, etc., are also included here under the general connotation of wrong orifice) is sexual misconduct whether done with a man or a woman.

Masturbation, for lay people, is not included in sexual misconduct.

By the way, your sig is incredibly racist and factually wrong.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

My understanding is that as both are forms of Dark Blue Garuda from the same terma, the donwang for one of them grants permission for the practice of both, together with the medicinal practices and mantras.

Malcolm wrote:

They are separate empowerments completely, albeit from the same overall cycle of teachings.

Rinpoche has regularly been giving the lung main mantra for Khyung nag since last year.

Retreat on either form of garuda, or even having completed the three roots recitation, is sufficient for reciting the action mantras, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

It is confusing! Isn't it?

[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

He did not give the transmission for the snags 'bum which contains the action mantras

during last year's retreat. This year, he gave the so called snags 'bum lung during the Moscow retreat, but he had already given the whole lung for the medicine tantra which contains many mantras many of which are also in the snags 'bum. This time he gave the lung for the mantras in the snags 'bum of Lama Zabdon as well as the remaning mantras in the medicine tantra. The release of the book was timed to coincide with the conclusion of this retreat.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

Yes, I read the announcement in Norbunet as well.

In this case, SSI must clear up why someone had to be present during the retreat in Merigar West and it is not enough to have received that transmission only through the webcast of last year, while the transmission from Kunsangar North is enough to have been received only through webcast this year.

I never heard such announcement by Rinpoche himself. He always says that transmissions through any webcast are enough for practising any mantra.

It is confusing! Isn't it?

Pero said:

The mantras weren't transmitted over the webcast last year, neither was there a donwang.

Dronma said:

I don't remember now what was or was not transmitted during the retreat of the last year, and it is not that I don't believe you, but it is something that SSI must write clearly.

Don't you think so?

Malcolm wrote:

It was not because I wrote ChNN about it last year and while the teachings about Garuda were webcast, the empowerment and the transmission of the mantras were not.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

arsent said:

arsent wrote:

There is a new book and ebook available from European SSI bookstore related to the last dark Garuda practice teachings retreat.

http://www.shanghungstore.org/index.php?l=product_detail&p=491 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Important note by SSI about this book:

The Practice and Action Mantras of Dark Garuda is reserved for those who have received the direct transmission of these mantras from Chögyal Namkhai Norbu and were thus physically present at the Dark Garuda retreat at Merigar West on the days when the mantras were transmitted or at a later retreat on this Dark Garuda practice. from Norbunet today's list: "The Practice and Action Mantras of Dark Garuda is available for all practitioners who received the related transmission from the Master.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu gave the transmission of the practice at Merigar West in August 2011 and during the closed webcast from Kunsangar North on July 25 to 29, 2012.

To be eligible to do this practice and read the book, you must have been present at Merigar West on the day when the mantras were transmitted during the August 2011 retreat or listening to the webcast from Kunsangar North on July 27, 2012.

If you wish to purchase the booklet and CD or ebook and downloadable MP3, please log in to our webshop at <http://www.shanghungstore.org> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;". These product are for personal use only and cannot be reproduced in any form.

Although there are differences in the two practices and Rinpoche transmitted a different root mantra for the two teachings, he has confirmed that the eligibility extends to those who participated in the mantra transmission of either teaching.

"

Dronma said:

Yes, I read the announcement in Norbunet as well.

In this case, SSI must clear up why someone had to be present during the retreat in Merigar West and it is not enough to have received that transmission only through the webcast of last year, while the transmission from Kunsangar North is enough to have been received only through webcast this year.

I never heard such announcement by Rinpoche himself. He always says that transmissions through any webcast are enough for practising any mantra. It is confusing! Isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Last year's transmission of Khyung Nag could not be given as a donwang -- Rinpoche mentioned this during the Moscow retreat a couple of days ago. However, he was able to give Takhyung as a donwang. In any case, the medicine tantra has a homage to Takhyung in the very introduction, so the Takhyung practice is more closely related with the transmission in the Srog sman tantra he gave last year in Moscow than the Khyung nag practice he gave in Merigar last year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 30th, 2012 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

With masturbation or anal sex there's no contact between opposite poles.

Malcolm wrote:

You do understand that jñānamudra practice for monks or single yogis (male or female) involves masturbation?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 29th, 2012 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Renunciation

Content:

JKhedrup said:

With words I am always interested in how the Tibetan gives it, because there can sometimes be several different English translations for the same word. In Tibetan nges par 'byung ba is the word that is often translated into English as renunciation. In fact if you break down the word nges par is "definitely" and byung ba is emerge, hence another translation is definite emergence.

To me this carries a connotation of definitely wanting to emerge from, to get out of, that which binds us, and to eventually leave samsara behind.

Malcolm wrote:

nges par 'byung ba = niḥsaraṇaḥ

Cologne Digital Sanskrit Lexicon: Search Results

1 niHsaraNa n. going forth or out MBh. Pan5c. ; issue , egress , gate L. ; means , expedient , remedy to get rid of (comp.) MBh. ; departure , death final beatitude L. ; %{-vat} (%{niH-sa4r-}) mfn. flowing out , liquid S3Br.

2 niHsAraNa n. turning out , expelling Ra1jat. ; egress or road of egress L.

The Pali Text Society's Pali-English dictionary.

Nissaraṇa

Nissaraṇa (nt.) [Sk. niḥsaraṇa, to nis+sarati, cp. BSk. nissaraṇa giving up (?) AvŚ ii.193] going out, departure; issue, outcome, result; giving up, leaving behind, being freed, escape (fr. saṅsāra), salvation Vin i.104; D iii.240, 248 sq.; S i.128, 142; ii.5; iii.170 (catunnaṇ dhātūnaṇ); iv.7 sq. (id.); v.121 sq.; A i.258, 260; ii.10 (kāmaṇaṇ etc.); iii.245 sq.; iv.76 (uttariṇ); v.188; M i.87 (kāmaṇaṇ), 326 (uttariṇ); iii.25; It 37, 61; Ps ii.180, 244; Vbh 247; Vism 116; ThA 233; DhsA 164; Sdhp 579. Cp. nissaṭṭa & nissaraṇiyya. -- dassin wise in knowing results, prescient, able to find a way to salvation S iv.205; -- pañña (adj.)= °dassin D i.245 (a °); iii.46; S ii.194; iv.332; A v.178 (a °), 181 sq.; Miln 401.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

As others have also pointed out, ChNN is giving direct introduction ridiculously often... I can only think of one webcast in the last year when he didn't give it, and it was announced beforehand that it was a general public teaching and not a transmission. WWT is only as special as all of Rinpoche's other webcasts and vice versa.

Malcolm wrote:

A bit of history is in order:

Originally, we practiced the Guru Yoga of White A on Garab Dorje's anniversary at the same time, around the world, on the hour of Garab Dorje's birth. We also did the same Padmasambhava guru yoga of medium thun for Padmasambhava and Adzom Drugpa's anniversary. We did this because of the importance of these three holidays for practitioners in the DC.

Then, in the late 90's, Rinpoche instituted the WWT with videos, using a video to synchronize practitioners so he could give DI, stating that introduction is beyond the limits of distance -- i.e. just as long as practitioners were present following the tape, and he was following the tape, direct introduction was occurring. The reason was that he was trying to make it possible for interested newcomers to receive transmission even if they could not immediately attend a retreat.

With the advent of the webcasts, he was able to switch live broadcasts of the WWT on these three important anniversary days.

Ultimately, the import of WWT is to do Guru Yoga at these special times with the whole community around the world, and not just to receive DI.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 3:12 PM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nonetheless, Guru P was a buddha way before any of his consorts were. They obviously were not at the same level.

deepbluehum said:

Liberated does not equal fully awakened.

I would not regard Namthars written by disciples as accurate reports of the level of realization of this or that person.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't need to get hung up on stupid details. It's just an example. It's simple logic.

Guru P was enlightened before he got with Mandarava and Yeshe Tsogyal. So...[/quote]

According to their namthars both M and Yt were emanations also...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 10:19 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

deepbluehum said:

But if you want to use your version, the sisters were liberated and Milarepa was on the path, so again, they weren't on the same level.

Nonetheless, Guru P was a buddha way before any of his consorts were. They obviously were not at the same level.

Malcolm wrote:

Liberated does not equal fully awakened.

I would not regard Namthars written by disciples as accurate reports of the level of realization of this or that person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Sex and the Lama

Content:

deepbluehum said:

What it's meant is that both have received HYT empowerments.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what is meant that they are on the same stage i.e. path of application or seeing, etc.

The Tseringma sisters are not worldly deities, they were liberated by Guru P.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: How can Zen be considered it's own thing...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="/johnny\"/>
teacher?[/quote]

Experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 28th, 2012 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: What's up with Phantom59

Content:

Stewart said:

I'm not sure how others check Dharmawheel, but I always start with 'view active topics'... sometimes phantom59 has posted half a dozen or so topics and I have to scroll through all the bump to get to the threads I am interested in..

Can we poll people to see if they want it blocked or not?

9 times out of 10 the link takes you to a page with the exact same quote and little else!
It's pointless, I have rarely seen anything of interest on them.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. P59 is taking up bandwidth in a rather useless way. He should stick to phayul.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 27th, 2012 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: Drug relapse leads to broken Samaya?

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

OK, thanks,

so where is the line drawn? It seems that maybe samaya is not as cut and dry as a Hinayana vow, which is perhaps more confined within the dualism of right/wrong or good/bad. Does the samaya depend more on my state of mind than my actions? At this point I am truly interested because in my experience teachers haven't explained this after they gave empowerments. It seems that I may be dwelling on the situation a little too much, at first I was afraid that I had lost or damaged the transmissions somehow.

Troy

Malcolm wrote:

Breaking samaya means you don't care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 27th, 2012 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Drug relapse leads to broken Samaya?

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

I know nothing about the self-initiation practice, I always thought that's what lamas did before they gave empowerments. If someone could please inform me about samaya. I heard Malcolm say on DW that if we broke our samaya we would know it. What happens to the transmissions when our samaya is damaged? How exactly do we break samaya? Did this little (big) slip up of mine damage my samaya? Any help would be great, I don't have access to my lamas right now, so asking more experienced practitioners on this board is the next best thing, I guess.

Thanks,

Troy

Malcolm wrote:

Making mistakes is not breaking samaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 26th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

In replacing Guru Tragphur with Dorje Drollo in, say, the Short Tun, does he act as a direct substitute in the waxing moon phase, or does he also substitute for Simhamukha in the waning phase.

It seems that Yidam practices begin in a similar way to the Tun and continue into the natural state, so presumably the Yidam practice of Dorje Drollo or Guru Tragphur do so as well. I'm assuming this is quite different from their role in the Tun?

Malcolm wrote:
Direct substitute.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 26th, 2012 at 12:24 AM
Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya
Content:
username said:
ChNNR specifically said people organizing and inviting him for teaching around the world are specially advised to do Dorje Drollo.

Malcolm wrote:
Not that this is a bad idea, but he only gave this transmission once, this year, prior to losar -- so when did he say this -- I do not recall him saying this, but then my memory is not perfect, nor my attention.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 26th, 2012 at 12:18 AM
Title: Re: DC Practice Recommendation for Someone with Liver Failure
Content:
Blue Garuda said:
Thanks.

Has ChNNR ever given donwang for the White Garuda he mentions?

In terms of performing the Garuda practice for a sick person, before using the relevant Action Mantra, how much practice should be done with the main mantra?

If the guy needs help right now, will confidence in the main mantra suffice?

Malcolm wrote:
Main mantra includes all action mantras. However, you do the main mantra for a while in a qualified way -- one to three weeks, then you apply action mantra, if it works, than that is enough

In general, black garuda is connected with the cycle of teachings of which the srog sman medicine tantra is a part. So ChNN will give all action mantras related to that tantra this weekend. Last year he gave the lung for the whole tantra.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: DC Practice Recommendation for Someone with Liver Failure

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Does blue or red make a difference?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, Mandarava for reinforcing life force, garuda for eliminating disease, lots of mantra of five elements also. Either Garuda practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

tamm said:

I already sent a small note over to Blue Garuda about this, but thought it would hurt to ask here too; but do you guys think there is a way to get a membership set up and going soon enough to do the retreat things this week? I know it's super late in the game here and I did already email the webcast team, but the email I got back just didn't make sense to me.

So sorry for all the trauma!

Malcolm wrote:

If you live near a center or a gar, you should be able to attend in person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: DC Practice Recommendation for Someone with Liver Failure

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Of the DC methods that help with health, which one would be best for someone with liver failure? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Shitro.

M

deepbluehum said:

What if the liver is not completely failed, they are back to work and they are testing to see if he will need a transplant?

Malcolm wrote:

Probably garuda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: DC Practice Recommendation for Someone with Liver Failure

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Of the DC methods that help with health, which one would be best for someone with liver failure? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Shitro.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

pemachophel said:

The story I read in Bhutan when getting ready to visit Parao Taktshang was that Guru Rinpoche and Yeshe Tshogyal were in eastern Tibet practicing in retreat there. Yeshe Tshogyal saw that there were demons in western Bhutan that needed subduing. She urged Guru Rinpoche to go and do something about this. He did not. Yeshe Tshogyal got more and more impatient and insistent. She eventually transformed into a tigress to fly to western Bhutan to do something Herself. At that point, Guru Rinpoche mounted the tigress and They flew together to Paro Taktshang, etc., etc., etc. However, I also think I have heard that the tigress was a Bon deity (possibly from Lama Dawa Chodak).

Seems like there are different versions of the explanation of Dorje Drolo's tigress mount.

Malcolm wrote:

I was not insisting it was the only account, merely the account I heard from one source.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

mutsuk said:

Maybe, but then you should understand that it's not the way it is for Bonpos. Ati Muwer is a peaceful dharmakaya form. There is no other Ati Muwer in Bon...and no tiger around him.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I do understand that. Prior to this conversation, I had no idea. I am not an expert in Bon.

But it is a fact that Drollo's mount Ati Muwer was identified for me by ChNN as Ati Muwer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Relationships With Non-Buddhists

Content:

underthetree said:

relationships with non-practitioners tend to be fraught with differing values and life-goals.

As do all relationships, really. A relationship between two practitioners would be just as fraught when it came to worldly concerns, I'd have thought.

But I have no idea. You may very well be right. For me, my marriage - along with my family, my work and the rest of it - is part of my practice. I can't conceive of it any other way.

Malcolm wrote:

We should work with circumstances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Relationships With Non-Buddhists

Content:

underthetree said:

Do you really think not, Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

I really think it is better for practitioners to be partners with other practitioners. Of course, we should work with circumstances -- but in my life I have found that relationships with non-practitioners tend to be fraught with differing values and life-goals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

mutsuk said:

I don't think so...

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with ChNN. The only time I have ever heard the name "Ati Muwer" is in connection with Drollo, as his mount. Sorry, that is just the way it is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Relationships With Non-Buddhists

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Hi,

I just moved in with my (non-Buddhist) girlfriend, and we have been arguing a lot.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, it never really works with non-practitioners. Better for you to find someone in your sangha or a least another practitioner.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One, the tigress is a Bon deity, named Ati muwer -- oral communucation, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

mutasuk said:

However, it's pretty unlikely that it is named Ati Muwer.

Malcolm wrote:

Its name is Ati Muwer. I have heard Norbu Rinpoche discuss this on more than one occasion.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Discussion on Aversion

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I was questioning whether it is healthy to cultivate aversion, considering the emphasis Buddhism places on its being unhealthy. The consensus seems to be that for some cultivating aversion to samsara is more helpful than it is unhealthy, and I will go along with that.

Blue Garuda said:

I think it can easily be overdone, as I posted earlier. I've seen beginners leave after a few sessions when they were unfortunate enough to join the class when death and samsaric rebirth were topics.

One left for another reason, quote: 'That silly bugger is telling me I'm going to be reborn as a dog!'

Sometimes, when we understand the context ourselves, we forget how it appears to newcomers.

Negative teaching is a bit like: 'Do you want the bad news first.....or the bad news first! '

We can't all be inspiring teachers, I guess.

Malcolm wrote:

It is better to start with "your primordial state is perfect...." and then go from there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 25th, 2012 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

kirtu said:

unless Malcolm means the tigresses first heat ever?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, her first heat ever.

dakini_boi said:

This is interesting. What is the term in Tibetan, and why is it usually understood as "pregnant?"

Malcolm wrote:

The term is sbrum which has two meanings 1) A pregnant woman 2) A lustful woman.

The term refers to the second sense. Since tigresses are only lustful when they are in heat, and since in many sadhanas the tigress is termed gzhon nu i.e. young, hence the oral communication indicates that the tigress in question is experiencing her first heat and is in a fit of crazed lust. If you have ever seen a cat go through her first heat, then you

will understand better.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 24th, 2012 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

kirtu said:

unless Malcolm means the tigresses first heat ever?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, her first heat ever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 22nd, 2012 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Vajrakilaya

Content:

muni said:

sparks. To show how truly crazy he is, he dances on the back of a pregnant tigress...

Malcolm wrote:

One, the tigress is a Bon deity, named Ati muwer -- oral communication, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Two, the tigress is not pregnant, she is in her first heat -- oral communication, Khenpo Jigme Phunstok

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 22nd, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Large random shooting in Colorado

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The cause is epidemic blood lust.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I think the cause is gdon, spirit provocations.

M

Huseng said:

In your mind what is the cause of said provocations on the rise?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, many things, increased stress, pollution, non-virtuous activities, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 22nd, 2012 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Large random shooting in Colorado

Content:

deepbluehum said:

We need to counter this with the brightness of spirituality. Many on this forum, myself including, have a dour view of the world. I feel like this is wrong. It's time to be inspiring.

Malcolm wrote:

The greater the depth of darkness, the brighter mere sparks seem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 22nd, 2012 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Large random shooting in Colorado

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The cause is epidemic blood lust.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I think the cause is gdon, spirit provocations.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Radical Buddhism and the Paradox of Acceptance

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

To be fair most use consumerism, the entertainment industry, career climbing and many other pursuits to ignore how profoundly unfair and unjust the social order is.

Malcolm wrote:

Samsara is not "fair".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2012 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm not sure that's a workable analogy, Malcolm. Fascism is a political program. Islam is a religious identity.

Malcolm wrote:

When does a religious identity cease being an ideological commitment? What makes it sacred, as opposed other ideological commitments? Certainly, Facism was upheld with religious zeal. Often religion is used for political programs, etc. Where do we want to draw the line, and how do we do so?

M

Jikan said:

I agree that ideology (defined in the sense of false consciousness) and identification are certainly problematic in either case, but I don't think both Islam and Fascism (or rather being-a-Muslim and being-a-Fascist) are reducible to ideology. It's possible to be born Muslim, for instance, and hence to have an Islamic identity projected onto you; the current American president inherited some of this with his middle name (and hence the conviction among the wingnut-o-sphere that Barry Obama from Hawaii is clearly a Muslim and ipso-facto a "Terrorist"). It's not possible to become a Fascist without having made a choice. And unlike a traditional religious identity, which is essentially a social marker, you can choose to stop identifying as a Fascist, to stop doing or promoting Fascism, and you're done. Try no longer being a Muslim or a Jew for that matter; it would mean a change in your life on the magnitude of joining the witness protection program (new name, new family, new hometown, all that).

That's the distinction I'm getting at. I don't disagree with your premise that we really need to stop identifying and taking this stuff at face value as real (that's the "demystification" of ideology as false consciousness, which basically means coming to grips with your situation broadly speaking, not the make-believe world of us as good and them as bad). I disagree there's a significant and important human difference between Islam and Fascism that needs to be recognized, or else one risks minimizing one or the other.

Islam's a religion. Fascism is a political program. Different functions, different conditions, different consequences, some of which may overlap.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you saying that once born a Muslim, you cannot cease being a Muslim? Are you saying one necessarily chooses to be a republican? Because I certainly know Christians who have become Buddhists, etc. I know many people who are excoriated for changing their political beliefs, and know of some who have even been killed for it.

I think it is glib to propose that political idenities cannot be projected as easily as religious ones -- communist, facist, etc.

I don't think you are making very convincing arguments for privileging religious ideologies over political ones -- they are both equally malleable and susceptible to being culturally embedded -- for example, Socialism in Tuscany. Try being a Fascist in Tuscany!

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2012 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

Jikan said:

I'm not sure that's a workable analogy, Malcolm. Fascism is a political program. Islam is a religious identity.

Malcolm wrote:

When does a religious identity cease being an ideological commitment? What makes it sacred, as opposed to other ideological commitments? Certainly, Fascism was upheld with religious zeal. Often religion is used for political programs, etc. Where do we want to draw the line, and how do we do so?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 21st, 2012 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

It's not quite a 'serves them right!' comment yet, at least not explicitly. But it's damn close to being one.

Malcolm wrote:

People with differing ideological commitments often cannot live with each other. Fascists/communists, etc.

I wonder how Tobes would feel however if we replaced "fascist" for "muslim"? I am not recommending intolerance towards muslims, but I am curious if Tobes' "liberalism" can be extended by him/her to fascists as well.

Just when do we decide that someone's ideological commitments are toxic, and then what do we do about it?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 20th, 2012 at 7:25 PM

Title: Re: the ethnic conflict in Burma

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Some more light on the issue:

<http://www.zcommunications.org/democracy-and-slaughter-in-burma-gold-rush-overrides-human-rights-by-ramzy-baroud> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

tobes said:

Thanks. I am still at a profound loss as to why ****supposed**** Buddhists on this forum have been engaged in justifying this. It really doesn't say much for contemporary Buddhism....

Malcolm wrote:

It is simply evidence that some Buddhists follow the Dharma and others do not -- nothing more, nothing less. "Buddhism" is a sectarian identity, and as such, is susceptible to the flaws of the same.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 19th, 2012 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: transmissions, ngondro, samaya

Content:

pemachophel said:

Just because all ngondro contain the same elements doesn't mean that you can mix and match those elements as you choose.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not addressing a point that anyone has suggested. The OP wanted to know if they could change their ngondro practice, for example, and do a different one instead of the one they started with.

It is the opinion of some people this creates "traces" about not finishing this or that practice. It is the opinion of others that there is no fault at all. If you are interested in some other practice more than the one you are doing, then you can change. For example, if you are doing Sakya ngondro, but then decide you would rather do Longchen Nyingthig, then in my opinion, fine. If you have finished refuge/bodhicitta for example, and want to begin this new ngondro at Vajrasattva, then fine.

Refuge is Refuge. Why? Because if you are doing refuge correctly, not only do you imagine the gurus of the lineage specific that to that lineage, but you are always enjoined to understand the gurus and lineages of all teachings you have are present there as well. This is a universal instruction in every ngondro tradition. Therefore, for example if you are doing refuge in the Dudjom tersar ngondro, but have received Ngondro for something else like Sakya, Kagyu, etc., you are automatically including all those lineages. If you are doing a Nyingma ngondro, and it is dragging along, but become inspired by Karma Kagyu, and then you can approach this practice enthusiastically because you have a good connection with that teacher, for example, then it is better for you to change your ngondro and not be stuck in conceptual limits.

If you go to a teacher, and you want mahāmudra teachings, and they decide to begin with the 18 hells (as happened to ChNN), then since you asked for their teachings, you respect that teacher and listen to their teaching, even if you know the subject perfectly. Why? Because you asked. You don't decide to reject that teacher's teachings because it is not conforming to your perfect wish.

However, if you have received teachings, respectfully, then you make sure in your own practice that you are focusing the essentials of whatever practice you have received, and you do the practice/s that are really working well for you. You should not be passive and always expect this or that lama to know what is best for you. You should take responsibility for yourself because we are not children that need to be taught step by step how to tie our shoes.

If anything, what western practitioners lack is balance -- on the one hand, some practitioners simply will not follow any guidance at all. On the other hand, some practitioners refuse to think for themselves and become completely passive. Neither of these approaches is good. Practitioners need to consult with their teachers on essential points, and also need to take responsibility for their own practice and decide what is working, and what is not.

If you have the fortune of feeling that your teacher is an awakened person, like I do, then as username mentions, you should not be looking for any advice from anyone else but that person. If you do not have that feeling, then it is better not to invent it, and it is also better to take responsibility for your own practice and try to understand the essentials.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 19th, 2012 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: transmissions, ngondro, samaya

Content:

username said:

Not all ngondros are interchangeable, for example Troma Nagmo Ngondro is specific.

Malcolm wrote:

An exception which proves the rule. The Troma ngondro (which I have practiced) is, as you say, very specific and interesting. It does not contain Vajrasattva, for example (Three kāya dakini purification is used instead), though it contains the rest, and so on.

However, the vast majority of Nyingma, Sakya, and Kagyu Ngondros are basically the same with small variations in order, and differ only in the actual words, but do not differ at all in the essence.

And all ngondros all have exactly the same point, as you will readily agree, i.e. Guru Yoga.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 18th, 2012 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Spontaneously Arising Moral Ethics?

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I have a question about the context of moral ethics in Dzogchen. I understand in the context of Dzogchen realization one's compassion is non-directional and all-pervasive, and thus not a chosen attitude that one keeps reminding oneself about.

Malcolm wrote:

As it is said in the Nyinthig, the realization of emptiness is accompanied by the knowledge that engaging in non-virtue is pointless.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 17th, 2012 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: transmissions, ngondro, samaya

Content:

roman said:

I have been practicing a particular ngondro, but have also been given transmissions for others. I have been deeply contemplating changing my practice and have run into these questions. One, if one receives transmissions for other practices and don't do them is that breaking a samaya vow, of some sort. And, if I do change my ngondro, would that be breaking a samaya vow?

Malcolm wrote:

All preliminary practices are the same --they have refuge, bodhicitta, etc. It does not matter which one you do. You do the one you are doing, or you can do a different one everyday.

If you do one ngondro, you are doing all, so there is no break in "samaya".

If you change from one ngondro to another also no problem.

But bear in mind the real ngondro in Dzogchen is rushan and semzin, not counting.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 16th, 2012 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Rushan

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

the preliminaries are not seen as per se necessary regarding the Direct Introduction (DI).

Malcolm wrote:

Rushan is an indispensable preliminary practice in Dzogchen, and no one ever said otherwise.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 16th, 2012 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Bimala in the EU

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Bimala: is it available anywhere in the EU?

There's a few American sites that are willing to ship it to the Old World, but I'm a bit afraid of customs officers destroying the parcel as soon as they find out what's inside. And in Europe bimala does seem remarkably hard to find: Shang Shung Institute used to sell it, but they've apparently run out of stock - and that appears to be it, I know no other shop that has it on offer.

All your help will be greatly appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

I have Vimala.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 13th, 2012 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

Jikan said:

invocation implies bringing something into being (invoking it) with words. someone might invoke the power of a god in order to accomplish something.

supplication is what you do when you go to someone who is much more powerful than you (say a king or queen) and ask for help.

Dronma said:

Thank you, Jikan!

The meanings of these 2 words are similar in Greek: ἐπικλήση (invocation) and ἱκεσία (supplication).

In this case, I prefer "invocation" (ἐπικλήση), because it is more direct.

"Supplication" presupposes a strong dualistic view.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN uses the term "invocation" for two distinctly different kinds of texts i.e. smon lam i.e. aspirations (pranidhāna) and gsol 'debs i.e. petitions (adhyeṣaṇā).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 13th, 2012 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

. . . there are two systems.

The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam)

The Longsal system (which is the classical order of Indian cosmology): space, air, fire, water, earth (e yam ram bam lam).

Also these very same seed syllables in the latter system are also found in precisely the same order in Hindu element purification practice.

dakini_boi said:

What is the reason for the order of the elemental colors in the thun system? -

space - air - water - fire - earth

Malcolm wrote:

I think this is the order it is presented in Yoga/Kriya tantra system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 13th, 2012 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

Sherlock said:

Invocazione still doesn't quite mean the same thing as preghiera. On the other hand, maybe invocazione is much more commonly used in Italian than its English cognate, and ChNN chose this word with the implications behind it instead of prayer.

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer the word "supplication".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: FAQ: Dzogchen Community of Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche

Content:

Sherlock said:

Maybe an old student of ChNN can help me answer this: Why is "invocation" used so commonly in DC translations?

Most other translations will use "prayer" or something like that for the Invocation of Samantabhadra, Marmé Monlam, Seven-line Prayer/Invocation of Padmasambhava. I think invocation actually is a much better word, but I don't come across it much outside of literature about magic. Does it have something to do with Tsegylgar originally being a Fourth-Way Community which involved other magical practices?

Thanks for the fast SoV link. That's Adriano Clemente singing I think.

Malcolm wrote:

It has to do with ChNN learning Italian before English.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

Of course. But if they are not connected with already existed lineages of dzogchen - they can not refresh, can they? So if they can not refresh, what is their other purpose? As I know the tertön is always "connected".

Malcolm wrote:

Termas are always connected with Kama -- for example, Shitro is connected with Guhyagarbha, but also with the mandala of peaceful and wrathful deities that are found

directly in Dzogchen tantras such as the Rigpa Rangshar.

In this case, the klong gsal teachings are connected with the Nirmanakāya Dakini Gomadeva, the Sambhogakāya ḍākinī Guhyajñāna, etc. In terma there are many cycles of Guhyajñāna teachings. Guhyajñāna is the source of Simhamukha, Mamo Ekajati, etc., as well.

In general, with Gomadevi, there is nothing to refresh, it is unique. I do not know of any practice cycles previously that are connected with her. However, she however is a fully realized Dzogchen master, and you can read about her in The Great Image -- she is the ninth master in the lineage of Sems sde.

Mandarava practice on the other hand is a more recent practice of Mandarava.

Lama Khandro Thugthig has three series, outer, inner and secret. The outer practice concerns Guru Rinpoche and Jñānaḍākinī.

The klong sde cycle of klong gsal is based on the Vajra Bridge instructions of Vairocana, etc. So of course, for all of ChNN's klong gsal series there is a kama basis. If there was no Kama basis, it would not be a valid teaching.

So if someone has an open mind, and is interested, then they can learn the teachings of klong gsal and apply them. Otherwise, if you do not apply them, they are of no benefit at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

It does not matter what your opinion would be

KY

Malcolm wrote:

But it matters very much what my opinion is, since you are discussing why I acted the way I did.

I know perfectly well why I closed the Bon forum, much better than you, since I was the one who decided it needed to be done.

You can either accept my testimony, or you can continue with your speculations.

M

kalden yungdrung said:
Sorry, your testimony is not acceptable for me.

So it sure matters for you only, your opinion, that is very clear but not for the other party.
So i go on with my opinion and am not convinced, when i may say so? If to be not convinced would be equal to speculations, well that is up to you.
In my opinion word games.

KY

Malcolm wrote:
So what were my motivations for closing the Bon forum again? Just so we are clear.

(And is it really necessary to rehash something that happened on E-Sangha years ago, and something which I acknowledge was wrong, regardless of my motivations?)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:50 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

Mariusz said:
As I wrote traditional terma is from a tertön, the person from the time of original masters of Dzogchen who discovers again their teachings, like for example Pema Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:
It appears that Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is not that kind of tertön. He is a different kind of tertön.

Mariusz said:
Can you elaborate please? What is the connection of His pure dreams with already existed systems of Dzogchen, like Khandro and Wima Nyinthing?

Malcolm wrote:
You should ask him. In the end, all of these questions should be directed to Chogyal Namkhai Norbu himself.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:48 PM
Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?
Content:

kalden yungdrung said:
Could we all be wrong?

KY

Malcolm wrote:

When you speculate about my motives for closing the forum, yes you are wrong.

I am not saying that you are wrong about your experience at E-Sangha in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:46 PM

Title: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

It does not the matter what your opinion would be

KY

Malcolm wrote:

But it matters very much what my opinion is, since you are discussing why I acted the way I did.

I know perfectly well why I closed the Bon forum, much better than you, since I was the one who decided it needed to be done.

You can either accept my testimony, or you can continue with your speculations.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

Yes, these are the question I also have: 1) is this "new complete system" possible (for example from pure dreams of people who have never met dzogchen before)? 2)why to create "new complete system" again, as one always can ad something (a supplement) within it to instruct others? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

1) I don't think so.

2) If this question is about ChNN -- it appears that he is merely expressing his experience. If you find Longsal useful, than practice it. If not, then don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

As I wrote traditional terma is from a tertön, the person from the time of original masters of Dzogchen who discovers again their teachings, like for example Pema Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:

It appears that Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is not that kind of tertön. He is a different kind of tertön.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

The other links tell something about the hard wind that blew against all that was not Buddhist in the way you did wanted that. Bon did belong to that black group.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, everything in that thread is speculative, i.e., has nothing to do with my actual motivations for closing the Bon forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Bon forum was closed at E-Sangha, because the Buddha Shakyamuni would be the only source of blessings regarding Dzogchen according to Namdrol's opinion.

No, this is a false statement -- I never made such claim, and would never make such a claim.

The Bon forum was closed for the reason I stated above.

kalden yungdrung said:

Here something to refresh your memory:

<http://esanghalert.wordpress.com/category/bon-banned/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://www.openbuddha.com/2008/03/17/e-sangha-drama-continues/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://yungdrung-rignga-ling.forums-free.com/bon-esangha-namdrol-please-help-t217.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

The first link has nothing to do with the closing of the Bon forum. The second link just validates what I said above. The third link I cannot read because you never approved my application to read posts on your forum.

kalden yungdrung said:

It was a long time ago but your ending words regarding the closed Bon forum were that in our Kali Yuga age or time, the Buddha Shakyamuni would be anyway the source of blessings. That was that what i have in mind and nevertheless that you deny it i keep it like that.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, I was making a bit of a different point/ The reason there was Buddha's teaching in India is that there was a Buddha. Bon owes a huge debt to Buddha's teaching in terms of texts, theory, etc. But because Bonpos will not acknowledge this, at that time I closed that forum. I realize now that our decision to close the Bon forum at that time for that reason was wrong. It was wrong not because I have changed my mind about history, but because I was not paying respect to your beliefs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The klong chen 'od gsal mkha' mgro snying thig aka Longsal teachings, is a complete and independent cycle of teachings which contains various teachings on Dzogchen (sems sde, klong sde and man ngag sde), related anuyoga cycles such as Mandarava, Gomadevi and Jñanadakini, and various kinds of completion stage practices. They form the main core of his own practice.

They are all products of Rinpoche's dreams, and the complete details of each series of dreams as they were written down by ChNN is provided in detail in the books that accompany the root texts. Sometimes, it took several dreams over many years to produce a root text, because for whatever reason, the text was not able to be written down completely.

They are not traditional terma teachings revealed in the traditional manner i.e. he received an index, etc., and then went and took them out of the ground, etc.

My remark about new termas comes from my master, the late Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, who considered ChNN to be an incomparable master of Dzogchen (his words, not mine). KDL said that since there is no samaya breakage with new termas, they have stronger blessings. And to practice the termas of a master while he is still alive carries the greatest blessings of all.

M

rai said:

What would be the most essential practice from Rinpoche's terma cycle?

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Yoga. However, he also stated that Jñānaḍākinī was the essence of Longsal. He himself practices Mandarava everyday.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

the terma of Chanchub Dorje

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily mind termas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

If you take for example Khandro Nyinthig, it was the same complete system every time, from Pema Ledrelstal, Longchenpa, Pema Lingpa. I don't know how are the pure dreams? Perhaps they are useful for already realized master of Dzogchen only as a supplement for his complete system from the source elsewhere?

Malcolm wrote:

The klong chen 'od gsal mkha' mgro snying thig aka Longsal teachings, is a complete and independent cycle of teachings which contains various teachings on Dzogchen (sems sde, klong sde and man ngag sde), related anuyoga cycles such as Mandarava, Gomadevi and Jñānadakini, and various kinds of completion stage practices. They form the main core of his own practice.

They are all products of Rinpoche's dreams, and the complete details of each series of dreams as they were written down by ChNN is provided in detail in the books that accompany the root texts. Sometimes, it took several dreams over many years to produce a root text, because for whatever reason, the text was not able to be written down completely.

They are not traditional terma teachings revealed in the traditional manner i.e. he received an index, etc., and then went and took them out of the ground, etc.

My remark about new termas comes from my master, the late Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, who considered ChNN to be an incomparable master of Dzogchen (his words, not mine). KDL said that since there is no samaya breakage with new termas, they have stronger blessings. And to practice the termas of a master while he is still alive carries the greatest blessings of all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

Unknown said:

The Bon forum was closed at E-Sangha, because the Buddha Shakyamuni would be the only source of blessings regarding Dzogchen according to Namdrol's opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is a false statement -- I never made such claim, and would never make such a claim.

The Bon forum was closed for the reason I stated above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This thread has recently become quite silly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

. But the E-Sangha fire is again burning somewhere else.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, you are setting the fire, and epitomizing that which you disliked on E-sangha. Oh the irony.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

By the way if we get the Rainbow Body in the Bon Zhang Zhung Nyengyud, then we do belong also after that attainment to the Lineage of Taphirista.

But that i never can explain and defend at your home here and now. So where can i do that? Only at the Bon sub forum

So out of conciderations we keep it there and nowhere else.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Taphihritsa is an important lineage master in Dzogchen Community, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 12th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Andrew108 said:

In this forum there is so much clinging to the form and words of the teacher. This isn't Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There is indeed much clinging to words and form. But that is not our business.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 11th, 2012 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sönam said:

If you speak dzogchen, ChNN is incontrovertible!

Sönam

kalden yungdrung said:

That is sure your private opinion, no doubt about it.

It sounds like propaganda or advertisement as the best here and there.

Better to discuss general topics, which are agreed by all Dzogchen Traditions.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

This thread is DC specific, so it is better to discuss things connected with the teaching of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 11th, 2012 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The main point is that we have to respect each other. That does not mean we have to agree about everything.

As far as DC topics go, we need to respect that closed webcasts are closed for a reason. People should not be having disagreements about what ChNN says in forums like this. If you have doubt, make an effort to purchase the mp3's.

People in the DC need to respect other people's POV. This does not mean that we have to agree, or admit they are right. We only need to pay attention to our own practice without attempting to condition others.

For example, many people think you need to be a Buddhist in order to be a Dzogchen practitioners. I don't agree, but I respect the opinion of those people who think so. Their approach is not wrong. But neither is mine.

ChNN is an unusual teacher. He is not presenting Dzogchen as part of the Nyingma or Bon traditions. We who are his students do not necessarily consider ourselves Nyingma or Bon. Some may, but most of us do not. This can cause some misunderstanding.

So, non-DC people need to understand that attitude of DC people is not typical of Tibetan Buddhists in other traditions, including Bon. DC people need to respect that Buddhists have a very specific POV around Dzogchen. If this is kept in mind, and we communicate with respect, then this will eliminate most problems.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 9th, 2012 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I agree with lightening the atmosphere as the last thing you want is panic, but think ChNNR, once he knew it was a fire alarm, should have immediately asked everyone to calmly leave. I'm sure he is very familiar with these large group meetings, and already had everyone's attention.

Malcolm wrote:

While ChNN was kidding around with the audience, we had sent someone to the administration office to discover if we needed to leave the building. This the 2 minute hesitation you observed.

When it was determined we needed to leave, we left immediately, as you saw.

This building is a solid brick building, single story with almost no wood, or other flammables apart from classrooms and the auditorium, built in the late 60's. There was never any real possibility of a fire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 9th, 2012 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I was the person who told the boss we had to leave during the fire alarm. But announcements are made by others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 9th, 2012 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Oh, and the schedule for the current retreat that I downloaded, says that the Ganapuja is tomorrow.

But did I hear an announcement today correctly, that there will be a Ganapuja today at 2 PM EDT?

Sally Gross said:

I think you heard correctly: as I recall, Malcolm announced it immediately after the

teaching session.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi,

FYI, I am not announcing anything -- that is another guy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 5th, 2012 at 7:22 PM

Title: Re: How are offerings accepted?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Does the "outer" offering then have any value at all?

Malcolm wrote:

It strengthens your intention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 5th, 2012 at 10:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Garuda Practice And Cancer

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Someone also just suggested Vajra Armor (Dorje Gotrab) which is supposedly more of an all-encompassing healing practice, would that be a better option? Or a good practice to do in addition to the garuda (as a supplement)? I know the garuda is specifically for cancer, being that cancer is generally a naga provocation. Again any information and/or suggestions are much appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

Garuda.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

That's silly.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you have a sutrayāna view of things.

Virgo said:

Malcolm these different channels have to do with different winds which relate to the different consciousnesses?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 9:40 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

That's silly.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you have a sutrayāna view of things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I have often felt intuitively that tantra's obsession with numerical correspondences was rather arbitrary.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it is physiological.

deepbluehum said:

So the eight spokes actually correspond to the 8 consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

....

When we eat meat (or anything else) mindfully, we create a connection with all those animals through our shared rtsal energy. That gives them a connection to meet the teachings through us.

M

Inge said:

Hi

Could you explain a little about rtsal energy? What it is and how it works?

Malcolm wrote:

Rtsal is how the primordial state manifests.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I have often felt intuitively that tantra's obsession with numerical correspondences was rather arbitrary.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it is physiological.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

This time we have new needs.

Malcolm wrote:

Makng Milanese stew however is not the solution.

deepbluehum said:

That's what happens when you take really divergent systems and try to combine them,

like Christianity, Hinduism and Buddhism.

What I'm making is more of a reduction.

Malcolm wrote:

It won't work. The terms of these different tenet systems are incommensurate. Of course you can have critical reevaluations of them, such as Candrakirti's revaluation of the term ālayavijñāna as "consciousness apprehending the basis i.e. emptiness, but it does not mean there is a unified field theory that ties all these tenet systems together. Realism includes all tenet systems up to the level of Madhyamaka. Even Madhyamaka subscribes to a qualified realism through its teaching of the two truths. Mahamudra does not really go beyond Madhyamaka in this respect.

The use of the eight consciousnesses in Vajrayāna systems is related to the eight channel spokes of the heart cakra, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

This time we have new needs.

Malcolm wrote:

Making Milanese stew however is not the solution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

Jnana said:

Well, I'd suggest that at some point practice becomes radically simple and these apparent discrepancies lose momentum and fall away.

deepbluehum said:

Yes. That is the practice side. I thought we were talking about the explanatory side.

Malcolm wrote:

The basic point is that different explanations were elaborated at different times, for different purposes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 4th, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Very cute and poetic. Can't do much with it. The Buddha boiled it down to 12-links.

Malcolm wrote:

The twelve links can be further reduced to three, as Nagarjuna puts it --> affliction --> action --> suffering --> affliction -->.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

The Seeker said:

Malcolm, that is a large scale operation, but there are many that are quite large that don't use manure of any type or any animal byproduct as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Animal manure = sustainable soil fertility. That can be enhanced by carcasses of various kinds properly composted, etc.

However, in this day and age of soil depletion either one uses chemicals, or one uses the results of animal husbandry, manure, etc. The latter is, in my opinion, better for the earth. Of course organic fertilizers are not restricted to feather, blood and bone meal -- but they are used extensively and you will readily agree, they are an important component of present day organic agriculture.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Meru?

Content:

underthetree said:

Historically, how long has Mount Kailash been regarded as Mount Meru, and in how many cultures?

Malcolm wrote:

Only by some Tibetans. Indians never thought Meru was Kailash.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Where is Mount Meru?

Content:

Huseng said:

In many Indo-European religions we find reference to a mountain being at the center of a culture's cosmological vision. For example, Olympus (Greek), Asgard (Norse), Harā Bərəzaitī (Persian) and Mount Meru (Indic).

Clearly the fact these diverse cultures share the same mythological element speaks of a common source.

So what are we to make of it? This is a controversial issue in modern times because it has been discovered that our planet is not made up of four continents with Meru at the center.

However, Mount Meru is said to be the abode of various deities up to a certain point, which would indicate it is not physical, but something beyond our ordinary physical realm.

The Vedic proponent Richard Thompson in his work Vedic Cosmography and Astronomy suggested that Mount Meru is part of a transcendental cosmological map. He demonstrated that the ancient Indians had scientific astronomical knowledge, but given the divine nature of the knowledge it extended beyond the physical realm, hence beyond what we can ordinarily perceive.

Or are we just talking about ancient cosmology that failed to pass the test of modern cosmology and hence can be set aside without further ado?

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Surya Siddhanta, Meru is the north pole.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 9:04 AM

Title: Re: Yangzab and Chokling tersar

Content:

roman said:

Malcolm-- would say them the Yang zab would not be complete? To me it sounds like no. Can you tell me more of the Yang zab....you have studied it under Lamkhyen Gyalpo Rinpoche, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yangzab is 98 percent sadhanas.

It really only has one or two actual Dzogchen texts. Yangzab is an appendix to Khandro

Nyinthig and is meant to be practiced in conjunction with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 9:02 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are totally missing the point -- organic agriculture depends on animalby products. In order to eat rice, you need slaughtered chickens.

gregkavarnos said:

Not all organic fertilisers are made from the feathers of slaughtered chickens. There are also manure based organic fertilisers.

The Seeker said:

You two are also missing the point that in an organic set up compost of only plant matter is more effective than any animal byproduct. The animal byproduct isn't necessary in plant production.

Malcolm wrote:

In large scale operations, it is more then essential.

For example, Lundberg farms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 9:00 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are totally missing the point -- organic agriculture depends on animalby products. In order to eat rice, you need slaughtered chickens.

gregkavarnos said:

Not all organic fertilisers are made from the feathers of slaughtered chickens. There are also manure based organic fertilisers.

Malcolm wrote:

Manure is fantastic, but it is not as nutrionally dense as feathers, bone meal or blood meal -- which is why it is used in large scale organic farming.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:54 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

The discrepancies between Mahayana, Vajrayana, Mahamudra and Dzogchen. Mahayana you have Yogacara and 8 consciousness. Vajrayana goes along with that somewhat but Kagyu Mahamudra makes this distinction with Alaya as pure. Then, Dzogchen says Alaya is ignorance and posits the Gzhi.

Malcolm wrote:

Different terminology elaborated at different times, for different purposes, for different reasons. There is no need to try and sew it all up in a nice neat package.

"A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines. With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do. He may as well concern himself with his shadow on the wall. Speak what you think now in hard words, and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict every thing you said to-day. ó 'Ah, so you shall be sure to be misunderstood.' ó Is it so bad, then, to be misunderstood? Pythagoras was misunderstood, and Socrates, and Jesus, and Luther, and Copernicus, and Galileo, and Newton, and every pure and wise spirit that ever took flesh. To be great is to be misunderstood."

--- Ralph Waldo Emerson

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Obviously. If you really are going to hold this as a view, then there is no reason even to use something like an 8 Consciousness model. The model is there to represent what happens when you don't know all consciousnesses are empty.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the model is actually there to explain, among other things, why it is that when someone experiences nirodha samapatti, their mind can resume functioning.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

But if you take the alayavijnana to be emptiness...

Malcolm wrote:

But it isn't, except in Candrakirti's scheme of things.

deepbluehum said:

So what you are saying is you don't agree with Candrakirti. You haven't shown "it isn't."

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakirti has no interest in representing the yogacara theory from the point of view of Yogacarins. He is only interested in negating it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Yangzab and Chokling tersar

Content:

roman said:

Until Chogyal Namkhai Norbu-- and his klong sde is much more detailed than the klong sde section in the sde gsum.

What about the klong sde section in the yangzab? Isn't being clear subjective, or is it that much clearer?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no sems sde or klong sde in the yang zab.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

But if you take the alayavijnana to be emptiness...

Malcolm wrote:

But it isn't, except in Candrakirti's scheme of things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 3rd, 2012 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Dzogchen is the 8th.

Malcolm wrote:

So you have just reduced Dzogchen to the level of mind.

deepbluehum said:
Not really. 8th is emptiness, etc.

Malcolm wrote:
All consciousnesses are empty.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 10:24 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:

seeker242 said:
And the amount used to grow grain to feed to cows to raise for food, is in the trillions of tons. And at the end of that, you get to dine on a dead carcass.

Malcolm wrote:
You are totally missing the point -- organic agriculture depends on animal by products. In order to eat rice, you need slaughtered chickens.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 10:05 AM
Title: Re: Yangzab and Chokling Tersar
Content:
Roman said:
but only Chokgyur Lingpa transmitted the Space Section.

Malcolm wrote:
Until Chogyal Namkhai Norbu-- and his klong sde is much more detailed than the klong sde section in the sde gsum.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 5:32 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Blue Garuda said:
The quote was something about students (in SOV?) looking at the sky instead of looking at him.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, that is right, when singing SOV it is better to gaze at the boss than over his head. I have heard him say this myself.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Lojongs, Rushens, and Semdzins

Content:

CrawfordHollow said:

Also, after one has recieved transmission from ChNN...does that give one permission to start the rushen practice,

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jacob said:

If I had once DC membership but I didn't buy it this year, can I still use my login and password and listen to restricted webcast?

Malcolm wrote:

You ought to just pay your membership.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This webcast contained formal sems khrid/rig pa'i ngo sprod yesterday morning.

Greg said:

Thanks - it seems to have . . .not registered, or something. When was that, exactly? Understandable if you don't want to elaborate on public forum.

Malcolm wrote:

When he gave transmission in the last 45 minutes of the session.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

heart said:

That is not how my Guru explains it, he says that taking the result as the path means to take the natural state as the path since there is no other Buddha.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yidam is a symbol of natural state.

In general, however this language belongs to the vehicles of cause and result. There are specific passages in Dzogchen tantras which reject this language.

Taking the three kāyas into the path is different than taking the result as the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Greg said:

Point of clarification requested. I've read:

alpha said:

But does Rinpoche ever give pointing out instructions or direct introductions to rigpa as part of a webcast?

Malcolm wrote:

Always.

Greg said:

and

alpha said:

Would it be accurate to say that WHATEVER he says is actually pointing out?

Malcolm wrote:

Whenever Rinpoche is talking about Dzogchen, he is giving direct introduction.

N

Greg said:

But for webcasts such as this one that didn't include a more formal sems khrid/rig pa'i ngo sprod, is it considered a direct introduction/ww transmission for the purposes of permission to purchase and study books and so forth?

Malcolm wrote:

This webcast contained formal sems khrid/rig pa'i ngo sprod yesterday morning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No only this but the amount of animal products used to grow vegetables, rice, etc. is in the millions of tons.

gregkavarnos said:

Animal by-products not animal products.

Malcolm wrote:

Blood, bones and feathers are not animal products?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

Today ChNN Rinpoche clarified for one more time with the following words exactly that:

"Zen is Sutra teaching.

Dzogchen is part of Vajrayana".

Cheers!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 2nd, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

CapNCrunch said:

Dzogchen belongs to the teaching taking the result as the path

I just understood this statement to mean that the result (the fruit) is the path in Dzogchen - in the sense that it is often said that the state of guru yoga or "enlightenment" is the base, the path and the fruit of Dzogchen. Ergo, the result (the fruit of the practice) is also the path.

Malcolm wrote:

No, to take the result as the path means, for example, to meditate on oneself as a buddha, for example, Guru Dragphur, which is the method of Upa, Yoga, Mahayoga and Anuyoga.

One is not a buddha, but one takes the result as one's path.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

heart said:

Dzogchen belongs to the teaching taking the result as the path.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely not.

heart said:

It is called Vajrayana. "Dzogchen is a part of Vajrayana" ChNNR

Edit: I understand that this is also a name for the Lamdre teachings (after some google)
I of course don't mean that Dzogchen is a part of Lamdre.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

One does not take the path as the result in Dzogchen. For example, Vajrayāna is nominally part of Mahāyāna, nevertheless, Vajrayāna is not a causal vehicle. Vajrayāna in general is the result vehicle. Likewise, Dzogchen is nominally part of the both Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna but it is the vehicle beyond cause and result.

Hence my negation of your statement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Huseng said:

If you're vegetarian or vegan avoiding animal biproducts is almost impossible given than many ingredients in processed foods are derived from dead livestock in some form or another.

Malcolm wrote:

No only this but the amount of animal products used to grow vegetables, rice, etc. is in the millions of tons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Tögal for dzogchen beginners?

Content:

heart said:

Dzogchen belongs to the teaching taking the result as the path.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Great Depression History and its shadow

Content:

kirtu said:

Of course since 2007 US household wealth has once again dropped 40% - not the same as income but I personally know people whose personal income has dropped 90%.

These pages also raise an issue of people starving to death in the US during the Great Depression although that was in effect covered up.

Kirt

Huseng said:

Does everyone there have access to food stamps?

kirtu said:

I don't know as I don't know as I know almost nothing about food stamps even though I should have applied for food stamps three years ago.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Getting food stamps is a huge pain. They really ride your ass with paperwork, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Dzogchen is the 8th.

Malcolm wrote:

So you have just reduced Dzogchen to the level of mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

It is this erroneous thinking that has created so much confusion over the centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a simple definition found in various sutras.

deepbluehum said:

I question their validity.

Malcolm wrote:

Since the whole concept of the ālaya-vijñāna comes from sutra, it is a little strange to contest the definitions set out by the defining literature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

See I don't agree with you here. I think everything needs to be reconciled.

Malcolm wrote:

Have at it then -- but AFAIC, it is a colossal waste of time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

In Mahāmudra and Lamdre, ālaya refers to the nature of the mind i.e. inseparable clarity and emptiness. In Dzogchen ālaya refers to ignorance. It is very simple. Not even worth a discussion, really.

It's only polemics and one-upsmanship.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is just a different system with a different terminology.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The ālayavijñāna is afflicted since it stores the bijas of affliction.

deepbluehum said:

It is this erroneous thinking that has created so much confusion over the centuries.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a simple definition found in various sutras.

deepbluehum said:

Once all the traces have been eradicated, the ālayavijñāna disappears.

Emptiness can never disappear. The Alaya-vijnana is emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to the definition of Candrakīrti given in the Madhyamaka-avatārabhāṣyaṃ but not according to the definition of the cittamātra school. So you have to be clear whose definition you are speaking from. Incidentally, in the tantras, they use the definition of the cittamātra school since ālayavijñāna is relative consciousness that is a function of the body.

deepbluehum said:

There is a difference between the ālaya discussed in Mahāmudra teachings and the ālayavijñāna. However in Dzogchen teachings, the ālaya is also considered afflicted. In Dzogchen ālaya = avidyā.

I resolved these discrepancies. Take another look at my analysis. What you said might

be the formulaic subscriptions given by certain teachers from certain lineages at certain times, but there is no reason to think these should remain so fixed.

Malcolm wrote:

I go by the definitions provided in the man ngag sde tantras where the definition of the ālaya is well defined. It is of little use to reconcile different terminologies apart from noting that they refer to different things.

In Mahāmudra and Lamdre, ālaya refers to the nature of the mind i.e. inseparable clarity and emptiness. In Dzogchen ālaya refers to ignorance. It is very simple. Not even worth a discussion, really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Questioning Alayavijnana

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I tend to differ with Jnana's quoted material for the following reasons. The source is myself and my experience with oral transmission in the Vajrayana lineages.

The first Five Consciousnesses (Vijnana) correspond to each of the Five Sense Media (eye, nose, ear, tongue and body). The Sixth Consciousness (Manovijnana), postulating external "objects", corresponds to the Five Sense Bases or "sense objects." The Seventh Consciousness (Manas) is the afflicted consciousness that postulates a truly existent subject or "I." Alayavijnana is the eighth of the Eight Consciousnesses which is the nature of mind, Emptiness, Prajnaparamita, Mahamudra, etc. The sense-Vijnanas, the Manovijnana and the Manas are mutually conditioned by the Three Poisons (ignorances, attachment and aversion), and, together, these constitute the basis (alaya with a little "a") for samsara. The prime mover is the Manovijnana-Manas dynamic. Thus, the Alaya is not afflicted.

Malcolm wrote:

The ālayavijñāna is afflicted since it stores the bijas of affliction.

deepbluehum said:

Thus, the Alaya is neither perceived by the ignorant, apprehended, nor obscured. All the apprehension and obscuration is occurring from the seventh consciousness and below.

Malcolm wrote:

Once all the traces have been eradicated, the ālayavijñāna disappears.

There is a difference between the ālaya discussed in Mahāmudra teachings and the ālayavijñāna. However in Dzogchen teachings, the ālaya is also considered afflicted. In Dzogchen ālaya = avidyā.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 1st, 2012 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

There are several brands of vegetarian dog foods out there and there are several brands of vegan cat food already out there.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the very definition of animal cruelty -- like feeding corn to cows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Does it apply to all practitioners that they benefit the animal by eating it, or only those who are able to do so when in the natural state, as I am unsure how many DC members are at that level where it would be much help?

Malcolm wrote:

You can use a mantra as a support for blessing, such as om ah hum, or འ་ཏཱ་ཤཱ་མུམ་, or if you have the confidence of instant presence, that is sufficient. In any case, the main point is not to remain passive -- this is the fault of Mahāyāna style vegetarianism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

How about those who will not eat meat unless the animal died naturally or in an accident?

Malcolm wrote:

All death is natural and is a result of karma, including being butchered in an abbatoir.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

The original premise is that it is 'given' that killing animals can't be stopped.

Malcolm wrote:

It cannot be stoppped. Without animals, agriculture is not possible. For example, all commercial organic agriculture uses millions of ton of feather meal, bone meal and blood meal.

All farming results in millions of rodent, bird, and insect deaths.

So even when you eat your rice cake, you still have to do so with mindfulness of all the animals that died to bring that good to your table. So when you understand things in this way, then you understand that the arguments against eating meat are essentially silly and vain.

The only positive argument against eating meat is health. The way we consume meat in Western Industrial Society is not healthy. But the idea that eschewing meat stops the process of death is deluded.

When we eat meat (or anything else) mindfully, we create a connection with all those animals through our shared rtsal energy. That gives them a connection to meet the teachings through us.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

have I misunderstood ChNNR when he advised people to buy supermarket meat?

Malcolm wrote:

Completely. He is saying that the animal is already dead and refusing to purchase meat based on some fantasy that this will prevent the future slaughter of animals is therefore a fantasy-based decision. Worse, it means that from a Dzogchen POV, you are abandoning animals to limitless suffering. He says, and said last night that buying meats like sausage is even better since it is made from many animals and not just one. When you use this meat in a ganapuja, you create possibilities for that animal to be reborn as your student, etc.

Listen to his webcast from last night where he clearly addressed all of this, including criticisms directed at Dzogchen practitioners who advocate meat-eating as a compassionate thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 30th, 2012 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan translation challenge

Content:

conebeckham said:

Barnang= inner blazing?

Malcolm wrote:

བར་སྒྲོང་ i.e. the sky. Means the space in front of one, the "middle appearance".

ས་ i.e. earth, hence sky and earth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 28th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Pero said:

I don't see what it has to do with being a Buddhist or not. Dzogchen Tantras have teachings on the bardo. Actually I'm not entirely sure if they're not actually their source. But in any case that is why it is funny to say it's not a Dzogchen teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Phowa is not a specifically Dzogchen teaching.

The four or six bardo scheme is specifically Dzogchen and is not found in the gsar ma tantras, the main source for the teaching on bardos is nyi zla kha sbyor rgyud.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 27th, 2012 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jacob said:

Hm, could anyone explain me what's the function of serkyem practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Offering a drink to the four guests, focusing on the eight classes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

ChNN's guru yoga transmission is extraordinary form of guru yoga. ChNN is an extraordinary teacher. This is a very unique opportunity.

Malcolm wrote:

Preaching to the choir -- ChNN has been my root Guru since 1992.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

If they were truly pure visions, they would be Sambhogakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever you like to believe.

I am not going to discuss this further on an open forum.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thogal visions are not marigpa at all -- otherwise, they are not thogal visions.

Malcolm wrote:

?[/quote]

Marigpa is "subject-side", visions are "object side". When the display of the basis is recognized as one's own state, no more dualism, no more ignorance.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 8:50 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations
Content:

deepbluehum said:
The visions are not Sambhogakaya IIRC.

Malcolm wrote:
The visions are completley pure, meaning they are not fabricated by the mind.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 8:39 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
deepbluehum said:
The specific wangs for specific practices are required...

Malcolm wrote:
No, this not correct.

If you have DI, then all you need is lung for mantra and brief explanation of practice, in general.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 7:37 AM
Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen
Content:

BuddhaSoup said:
Now if only someone could tell me that, with no-self/anatta/anatman in mind, what survives death to occasion rebirth? A consciousness? A cosmic bit of dust? A semi-soul? A wisp of smoke that follows an extinguished candle?

Malcolm wrote:
Affliction and action.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 7:36 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Mariusz said:

What I wrote in the post above: the 3 visions of thogal are the second Marigpa which can have Samantabhadra and yet return (forth vision). All of them are not third marigpa where is the Mind. Please read Longchen Rabjam, Tulku Thondup: "The Practice of Dzogchen", Snow Lion Publications, 2002, ISBN 1559391790.

deepbluehum said:

I've studied the text. It doesn't seem to be well translated or the concepts don't jibe somehow or perhaps I don't follow your writing well. This presentation is a bit confusing and strange. Longchenpa was a great teacher, but I'm not that jazzed about his writing. The three visions of thogal are still marigpa because you don't recognize them to be your own appearance yet. There is still some dualism vision. The visions themselves are pure, they are neither samsara nor nirvana, but you are not Samantabhadra and neither are they. Longchepe's language often, to my mind, ventures into the realm of idealism.

Malcolm wrote:

Thogal visions are not marigpa at all -- otherwise, they are not thogal visions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 7:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

And yes they are "wisdom appearances" with the caveat that they are not yet completely pure...

Malcolm wrote:

They are completely pure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: Not Accepting, Not Rejecting

Content:

MalaBeads said:

It is easier for me to understanding the instruction "not rejecting". It is more difficult for me to see what is meant by "not accepting".

My own lifelong habit has been more to simply accept whatever was happening in my life and work with it. And then whenever I would reject something, someone, it would be with a vengeance.

So what do there's understand by this instruction "not accepting"?

Any and all help is gratefully accepted.

Malcolm wrote:

The term is more like "not rejecting, not adopting".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

All the manifesting is marigpa. Once you finally resolve the view, there is exhaustion of phenomena.

Mariusz said:

Even the visions of thogal? You know the exhaustion is the forth vision only.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all.

Thogal visions are wisdom appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 26th, 2012 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Mariusz said:

For example visions of thogal have nothing to do with the Mind, but it is possible to have breaks for ordinary life activity.

Malcolm wrote:

"Samantabhadra" is a state of total integration where it is impossible to return to the state of being an ordinary person.

Below this level, we have alternating experiences of rigpa and marigpa.

This does not mean we need to do anything to achieve awakening. We merely need to extend the period of our non-dual integration from nanoseconds to 24/7.

Samantabhadra has five definitions, one of those is "the basis Samantabhadra".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Mariusz said:

]When you recognize Rigpa, there is no Mind. However one moment later it arises somehow. It is called Marigpa. Even Samantabhadra can have Marigpa! Please read my notes: <http://www.lamrimnotes.webs.com/dzogchen.html>. More theory I don't know for sure, I'm a preliminary Dzogchen practitioner only and I'm focusing mainly on practice

heart said:

Samantabhadra don't have any ignorance, and so he have no mind (sem) either.

Sentient beings have mind (sem) and ignorance. I received very elaborate teachings on this over the years.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra had ignorance, but never experienced dualism because he recognized the arising of the basis as his own display.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Pero said:

What is the tibetan for "reenlightenment"? I don't believe this term actually exists.

Mariusz said:

I will look at book "the practice of dzogchen for it. Perhaps I heard it also from some Rinpoche, so I will check my notes. However the theory of dzogchen is not so linear as mahayana, especially in Nyinthig, and you can surprise yourselves

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra both possessed ignorance (innate ignorance and ignorance that resembles the cause) and once he recognized his own state, he never returned to a state of ignorance.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Jnana said:

You still fail to understand or acknowledge the point: There are people who are not receptive to dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, as the Dzogchen tantras openly acknowledge.

The job of the teacher is identify such persons and steer them to the appropriate spritual solution.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I feel like I shouldn't leave this hanging. I'll try to be reserved. For example, tanha doesn't mean desire. It means urge. Avijja doesn't mean ignorance. It means unawares.

Malcolm wrote:

Tanha [tṛṣṇa] means thirst. Avijja [avidyā] means not knowing [i.e.ignorance].

deepbluehum said:

I don't expect to convince you of something. I don't agree Buddha was saying thirst. He was talking about something deeper.

[/quote[]

Yes, he meant thirst, and yes, he was using the term to point to something deeper, the salt water of desire, etc.

He didn't mean to say knowing some information was overcoming avijja. He was talking about becoming aware of what's happening.

Malcolm wrote:

He was using it in both senses, knowledge that overcomes ignorance, knowing what is happening.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 8:15 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations
Content:

deepbluehum said:
I feel like I shouldn't leave this hanging. I'll try to be reserved. For example, tanha doesn't mean desire. It means urge. Avijja doesn't mean ignorance. It means unawares.

Malcolm wrote:
Tanha [tr̥ṣṇa] means thirst. Avijja [avidyā] means not knowing [i.e.ignorance].

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 3:19 AM
Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen
Content:
BuddhaSoup said:
...the original teachings.

Malcolm wrote:
There is no such thing.

BuddhaSoup said:
There does seem to be a consensus view that the original teachings of Gautama were kept within the oral tradition of his monks, who met after his death to organize the teachings. Over time, these teachings were written down; how accurately in anyone's best estimate, but the scholarship suggests that there is a uniform agreement that the Buddha's teachings on Four Noble Truths, Dependent Origination, among others, survived fairly intact.

Malcolm wrote:
Even the Buddha acknowledges that he is not the first Buddha, hence his teachings are not "the original".

This notion that Gotama Buddha's teachings in the Nikayas/Agamas are the "originals" is purely a scholastic artifice and should not be believed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 1:05 AM
Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona
Content:

pemachophel said:
It would also be interesting to hear from some Tibetan Lamas why they don't speak out

in public on such issues.

Malcolm wrote:

Because they all have dirt on each other, or members of each other's lineages. If accusations start flying, it will never end.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I see. Is there a particular method for introduction by touch or are we assuming like some quick shock from a sharp touch for example?

Malcolm wrote:

Introduction need not necessarily be via a Hadawa. Could be something smooth, then something rough, etc. Anyway, while in principle we can consider that as long as a human being has some sensory capacity, they can receive introduction, practically speaking it is a little difficult if they are too sensorily deprived.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

If someone's deaf and blind, then what are they supposed to do? The master has to communicate somehow. A smile is a far cry from the Direct Introduction of Six A. There are those limitations that someone cannot overcome so it's next life for them.

Malcolm wrote:

Braile and touch.

deepbluehum said:

That's transmission by reading, which I thought was no no.

Malcolm wrote:

braile to communicate concepts, touch for introduction...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 12:04 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations
Content:

deepbluehum said:

If someone's deaf and blind, then what are they supposed to do? The master has to communicate somehow. A smile is a far cry from the Direct Introduction of Six A. There are those limitations that someone cannot overcome so it's next life for them.

Malcolm wrote:
Braile and touch.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 25th, 2012 at 12:02 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

deepbluehum said:

...Westerers need Asian culture along with Dharma instructions. Screw that.

Malcolm wrote:
Indeed.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 11:23 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Hi B:

You should not expect much at a short retreat. However, if you can, find Joe Evans.

He is here on Dwheel. He is there in Pasadena.

M

bjf77 said:

With all that I said before, in my previous post....I have a sort of bone to pick.
Before I say anything though let me preface it with this:
ChNN is amazing!! His teaching is amazing (method and introduction).

The community though, in my very weak and humble opinion, could use some work. I came out here to Pasadena, CA, from SLC, UT (there are NO other D.C. members in SLC that I know of), alone for this retreat...and I guess I shouldn't complain, because I did come out to meet ChNN and receive teachings in person. However, the community has been quite oddly 'distant' overall. People have been kind, polite, and genuinely 'nice', but have remained at a distance from me (and I assume from other loners at this event). I have remained a loner the entire time at this retreat. I have attempted several times to try to start conversations to get to know people and start to 'experience' the Dzogchen Community. I have been a member since 2008 and this is the first time I have had the chance to interact and relate with other members of the community in person. I don't feel like I am socially inadequate or awkward. Maybe a bit shy at times, but I tend to be able to make 'friends' fairly easily and am able to carry a conversation. I feel like I somehow, somewhere, missed some 'boat' though. The longest conversation I had was about 2 minutes and everybody seemed interested in ending our little chat as quickly as possible. It just struck me as odd.

Perhaps, the issue is one of expectation that should be dropped....A close friend of mine, I talked to via the internet tonight about this topic told me, "it's a great time to experience working with your own condition"...TRUE! But I can't help but feeling a bit disappointed. This is suppose to be a community, it's very name is such, the Dzogchen Community. In my opinion, it doesn't feel much like a community, but more of a 'fend for yourself' 'feel/mentality'. Perhaps it's just the mixture of people at this particular area/retreat? I don't want this post to come across as harsh....I love ChNN, the teaching, and the Community (at least with my limited digital contact) and was hoping that the experience would be reciprocal from the community. Apparently, this is an issue that exists in my mind as it is a judgement, a part of dualistic vision, and should be dropped.

So, what am I going to do, besides be aware of the judgement, emotion etc... and let it self liberate? Well, if I am ever fortunate enough to be at a D.C. event again, retreat, teachings, practice, etc.... I will make it a point to find that loner or 'newb' and welcome him/her and try to help them get their bearings, answer questions, get to know them, even invite them out for a lunch or dinner (if appropriate for the situation) and be as much like a 'community' member as possible, because I don't want another to have the experience that I have had with something that is so dear to me. I would challenge all D.C. members to do the same.

Much Love, Light, and Bows....

B

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

How can a deaf person hear transmission with their eyes?

Malcolm wrote:

Transmission is not only by sound, but can be communicated through any of the five senses. The main point is that they understand.

And then there is sign language.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Functioning senses is one of the endowments needed for this to be a precious human life, as explained in Mahayana and Vajrayana generally, let alone Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are Dzogchen instructions (thögal) for those who are blind explained in the Gongpa Zangthal teachings.

deepbluehum said:

Well that's encouraging. Dzogchen doesn't seem to leave any stones unturned. Is there anything to be done for deaf people who cannot hear transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

They have eyes, so yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen

Content:

BuddhaSoup said:

...the original teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Functioning senses is one of the endowments needed for this to be a precious human life, as explained in Mahayana and Vajrayana generally, let alone Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are Dzogchen instructions (thögal) for those who are blind explained in the Gongpa Zangthal teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

So Dzogchen would be not limited but a Dzogchenpa does to a certain degree. Karma is somehow still counting.....

Malcolm wrote:

"When we discover our limits we have to try to overcome them, untying ourselves from whatever type of religious, political, or social conviction may condition us."

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 193-195). Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 24th, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Ogyen said:

Attended my first ChNNR webcast for the Los Angeles Retreat- "Kunzang Monlam" Introduction to Ati Guru Yoga and tridlung of Short Thun.

Wow. Just wow. Like. Wow.

deepbluehum said:

It's hard to follow another teacher after hearing him.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 21st, 2012 at 9:40 AM

Title: Re: Balancing the Three Humors

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You have an imbalance of bad kan, phlegm. More exercise, lighter diet, etc. Go to an

ayurveda practitioner for a kapha balancing diet or consult an ayurvedic cooking manual for the same.

Do yantra, a lot.

Sherlock said:

Is an imbalance of phlegm also expressed through physical phlegm i.e. mucus from the nose and phlegm in the mouth?

Malcolm wrote:

Can be

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2012 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Unknown said:

News flash, if you follow the classic approach, you're expected to actually practice Dzogchen after perfecting kyerim, something most of you will never get to do. The defilements are considered so powerful these days, that some lamas will require not 100.000 of each accumulation, but 400.000.

Malcolm wrote:

This based on the idea that 100,000 is the Treta yoga amount, but since we are in Kali yuga, it is multiplied by four.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 20th, 2012 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: Dzochenpa Census

Content:

Clarence said:

Andrew, meet Geoff. Our resident genius hermit (I am being serious). He can read Pali, Sankrit and Tibetan and lives like a hermit. He is also a nice fellow from what I can gather of reading his posts for many many years. So, sometimes it is good to listen to what he has to say.

Sönam said:

Thank you ... my hears are whistling since a couple of days, since Malcom stopped answering there is a rush of arrogant and caustic statements.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Partly it is because I am on the road.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 19th, 2012 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

JKhedrup said:

I am a bit shocked but I guess I have not been following your postings of closely enough of late.

So in fact you see all those many years of learning Tibetan, studying the Sakya systems, translating those texts

and investigating the abhidharmakosha etc. as a waste of time. You think you would have been better off

just resting in your natural state.

OR Did it take that much to get to this point?

It is a bit discouraging to hear, somehow. For me personally, I couldn't imagine jumping into these formless

meditations without a sort of gradual progression. I guess according to the Dzogchen presentation I am a

dull faculty disciple. If I did think all the rest was unnecessary, I wouldn't have busted my butt these last few years learning Tibetan and translation. I really feel what Geshe la teaches me now

is what will allow these formless things to make sense in the future.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, don't get me wrong, I still enjoy reading texts like the Kosha and so on, but I am not longer under the il/delusion that liberation lies in that direction. Studying medieval philosophy, while entertaining, is a hobby.

As I said elsewhere, for Dzogchen all you really need to understand is the five poisons, the five elements, body, voice and mind, as well as the eight examples of illusion. That is about the extent of "abidharma" and madhyamaka you need to understand. You do not even need to understand the five aggregates, etc.

This dawned on me in April when I was teaching a course on Tibetan Medicine (which is all about the five elements and how they create, maintain and destroy the body) and realized that in all the thousands of pages of Tibetan texts I have translated and read of original Dzogchen material, apart from the five poisons, the vast portion of other topics in Abhidharma, the complex pirouettes of Abhisamaya, the scheme of the two truths and so on, is more or less completely absent in Dzogchen tantras apart from when they are criticizing these schemes or presenting the views of the different yānas.

Of course the Dzogchen tantras themselves deal with the doctrines of other yānas,

mostly critically. And of course to be a translator of Dzogchen texts etc., yes, you need to study everything from the three vows all the way up the ladder -- especially if you want to become enmeshed in the texts of Longchenpa. So in answer to your other question, I am not sorry for having studied anything. All study can be taken with you into your next life. I am a "knowledge friendly anti-intellectual" these days.

To practice Dzogchen, you need to study very little. You just need to receive transmission from a qualified master (cannot underestimate the importance of that) and then go practice. If you think you need to study many things to understand Dzogchen then you are wasting your time. Why can I say this? Because many simple, uneducated people have achieved total liberation through Dzogchen teachings. Butchers, hunters, farmers, stone carvers, laborers of all kinds, people who did not spend years in retreat learning complicated practices and doctrines.

Dzogchen boils down to rigpa and marigpa i.e. knowledge or ignorance of the real condition of your body speech and mind which is created out of the five elements [yes mind too is created out of the five elements].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

rai said:

it is great but it would be interesting to know how many are getting it.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as you are not passive and apply yourself, all will "get it".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

xylem said:

"will the true dzogchen please stand up" debate on DW.

-xy

Malcolm wrote:

It's been going on since E-Sangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Yudron said:

Malcolm this actually brings up an interesting point. I tried looking at some dzogchen tantras in the Nyingma Gyudbum, and they were handwritten -- difficult to read and containing a lot of scribal mistakes. Many criticize the bible for being so rife with scribal errors compounded one upon the other that it could hardly reflect the early documents it purports to represent... and perhaps intentionally distorted in places.

Malcolm wrote:

The Adzom Chogar edition of the seventeen tantras is the best; it is based on the Derge edition and provides all the alternate readings. For example, there were at least three manuscript traditions of the Rangshar -- the one in the Tingskye/Tsham brag edition is has differences in certain respects from the Adzom Chogar and is based on only one manuscript tradition.

Yudron said:

Now, I don't know why you look at the Dzogchen tantras from a religious view when you are eschewing religion

Malcolm wrote:

I don't "beleive" in the Dzogchen tantras, I have personal experience of what they are discussing (no this does not mean I am a realized person). So I don't look at them from a religious point of view -- they are experiential manuals.

Yudron said:

but clearly you believe, as I do, that they are not Tibetan inventions.

Malcolm wrote:

There are features of the Man ngag sde tantras that can only exist in native Tibetan compositions.

My view of the Dzogchen tantras is that they are human compositions, relative, and so confined in space and time to this epoch. For example, the Rangshar was taught by the primordial master Zhonnu Pawo Tobdan. But it also mentions Shankaracaraya and Kumarila who are both from the 7th-8th century. So when it was set down or recounted, in the enumeration of views, Vimalamitra or someone else, if it is really a translation, mentioned these Hindu masters who were of recent fame. So I think that the Dzogchen tantras have multiple layers and multiple authors. And this also does not mean that they do not have an oral origin in a guy named Garab Dorje -- we simply do not know.

But faith in the historicity of Garab Dorje, or the veracity of the traditional lineage account is unnecessary for the pratice Dzogchen. Even if Dzogchen were invented yesterday by Eckhart Tolle, it would still be a verifiable personal experience one can have.

For example, the Rangshar's colophon holds that Vimalamitra translated the text using copies in three languages, that of Sanskrit, Oḍḍiyānese, and rgya nag, which at the time, probably meant Central Asia (according to Hansen-Barber), but usually is understood as China by modern Tibetans. This is strange and interesting.

Yudron said:

So, we believe...they are not just 1,000 years old, but 2,000 or more years old.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure of that. All we know for sure is that around this literature emerged in the tenth century. We have no text datable prior to the tenth century apart from the Guhyagarbha tantra -- this is because Samyas burned down. Even so, the 17 tantras were supposedly confined to a single edition discovered by Dangma Lhungyal and given to Chetsun. Chetsun gave them to Zhangton in 1128 along with the Vima Nyinthig. He also gave them to Chegom who revealed some other interesting tantras (which are in NGB) that show up in slightly different recensions Gongpa Zangthal. At that time, Terma revelations were not so codified the way they are now. The colophons of the texts in the zangs yig can for example recommend that the practitioner himself conceal the texts for later times if he cannot find a suitable disciple.

Yudron said:

With each edition there have been scribal errors and edits by well-intentioned lamas trying to figure out what needs correcting--probably dozens of editions. Whomever Garab Dorje was, living in whatever era he did, what we have now as Dzogchen tantras clearly are not what he received from Vajrasattva.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, these texts have been subject to emendation and addition. One thing, Garab Dorje was a nirmanakāya -- his speech is Vajrasattva and his mind is Samanabhadra. The three kāyas are inseparable -- so the Samantabhadra --> Vajrasattva --> Garab Dorje lineage thing is just a literary device, and not meant to be taken literally, IMO.

Yudron said:

Did I read somewhere that Jim Valby inputted a critical edition of the main 17 tantras?

In any event, while very interested in the current redaction of these ancient documents, I place my faith in the personal menngak from current Buddhas who have accomplished the path in the present.

Malcolm wrote:

All the 17 tantras have been put on line in wylie, Valby's edition. They are a not a critical edition. For some tantras, he input parallel copies, which is better than "critical editions".

My present understanding of Dzogchen is entirely due primarily to the kindness of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, which is not to discount the

kindness of othe teachers.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: What is Yeshe?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If one knows [shes] the buddhahood that has always been [ye] naturally formed by nature,

there will be buddhahood of clear realization.

That is the definition of wisdom [ye shes].

Rigpa Rangshar tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Balancing the Three Humors

Content:

Clarence said:

So, after yesterday's talk about the practice of the night and balancing the three humors, I have some questions I hope you can answer.

Personally, I have a hard time remembering my dreams. It seems I sleep pretty deeply and, like Rinpoche said, don't feel like doing a lot of physical stuff during the day. All symptoms of heavy I couldn't make out what he said. Thing is, I don't sleep during the day nor do I fall asleep during meditation.

So, what could I do to lower the level of which makes for the heavy sleep? What diet is best? I am a vegetarian and would prefer to stay one.

Many thanks, Clarence

Malcolm wrote:

You have an imbalance of bad kan, phlegm. More exercise, lighter diet, etc. Go to an ayurveda practitioner for a kapha balancing diet or consult an ayurvedic cooking manual for the same.

Do yantra, a lot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Dependent Origination and Lhundrup

Content:

Sherab said:

Horizontal aspect of DO manifests as causal chain and when examine, points to impermanence of all phenomena.

Vertical aspect of DO when examine, points to sunyata.

In Dzogpa Chenpo, lhundrup is more fundamental than DO. Because of lhundrup, there is DO.

What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

I think that not recognizing lhun grub results in dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Yudron said:

Is Nubchen now the great oppressor?

Malcolm wrote:

My remark concerned Dalton, not Nubchen.

Anyway, the nine yānas are not a problem, since they include the tirthika vehicles as well, following the scheme laid out in the sgra thal gyur (first yāna, yāna of gods and humans).

The nine yānas are not reflective of the hostility Dzogchen received in Tibet, nor the continuing hostility Dzogchen has been subjected to in various Buddhist quarters, Sakya, Kagyu as well as Kadampa/Gelug.

The Bonpos, contrary to the post 10th century mythology of the imperial period, were never hostile to Dzogchen despite the fact that they definitely pushed back against in the three way political contest between Chinese influence, Indian influence, and native traditions.

It is funny you know: in the colophon of the Rigpa Rangshar tantra, when Trisong Detsen is presenting the Rigpa Rangshar to Nyanbang he says "This [tantra] is evil mantra (ngan sngags) that will ruin Tibet. If Tibet comes to ruin, you should move this outside of it."

What is hilarious about this of course is that the Rigpa Rangshar barely contains any mantras, has no methods of liberation or union, etc., and discusses the four empowerments of man ngag sde in only the barest of terms. But the message is

Dzogchen is that anyone can understand it and practice it (providing they have transmission of course). This is threatening to Indian/Kadampa style gradualism that has come to dominate all schools of Tibetan Buddhism including modern Nyingma and Bon.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

Adamantine said:

This is precisely the kind of snarky and cynical overgeneralization that reduces your credibility considerably.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not terribly worried about my credibility. That is other people's problem, not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:33 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Bhusuku said:

From the little I know of Bön scriptures, it really seems to me that most of them are interspersed with Dzogchen teachings...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the commentary on the Bon "abhidharma" attributed to Drenpa Namkhai mentions tregchö, for example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Bhusuku said:

It would be really interesting to know if they do Ngöndro the way Tibetans do. Unfortunately, I didn't come across any information about that yet.

Malcolm wrote:

They don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

Yudron said:

This teaching addresses the reasons that many lamas do not teach Dzogchen proper in public. This is similar, but not exactly the same, as the reasoning about why ordinary people like me—who are not even close to being Dzogchen masters--do not mouth off about Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Dzogchen is very threatening to Tibetan Buddhist hierarchy. When it is discovered that everyone has the same state, it really renders havoc to the feudal relations Tibetan Buddhism depends on for its economic functioning.

M

Yudron said:

I'm not a cynical as you, Malcolm. Our current Dudjom lineage holders--such as Khyentse Rinpoche--for example, are not trying to defend their power base, quite the contrary. Each of them cares only about how blossom enlightenment in us as quickly as possible. An this involves being very meticulous and careful, as Longchenpa recommended... carefully working with each student in an individualized manner and protecting them from derailment. They put all their heart into carefully guiding serious practitioners, and don't give a **** what one's nationality or pedigree is.

Malcolm wrote:

No disrespect, it's a nice sales pitch, but I am not buying it. No interested in religion anymore, Buddhist or otherwise, even packaged as "enlightenment" whatever that is.

But, different strokes for different folks, as the saying goes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Adamantine said:

These are just theories, and not corresponding to the way the Nyingmapas tell their own history.

Bhusuku said:

Well, if you read about tibetan history and not only about the "way the Nyingmapas tell their own history" you'll get another picture... Yudron suggested Dalton's "Uses of the Dgong Pa 'Dus Pa'i Mdo in the Development of the Rnying-Ma School of Tibetan Buddhism" earlier in this thread, and if I remember correctly, that text is a good start in this regard.

Malcolm wrote:

It's kind of funny to cite Dalton in defense of Nyingma orthopraxy since the conclusion of his PhD thesis is that Nubchen basically composed the anuyoga tantras with Chetsun Kye's help.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Khyentse Rinpoche on not Teaching Dzogchen

Content:

Yudron said:

This teaching addresses the reasons that many lamas do not teach Dzogchen proper in public. This is similar, but not exactly the same, as the reasoning about why ordinary people like me—who are not even close to being Dzogchen masters--do not mouth off about Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Dzogchen is very threatening to Tibetan Buddhist hierarchy. When it is discovered that everyone has the same state, it really renders havoc to the feudal relations Tibetan Buddhism depends on for its economic functioning.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 11:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He never stayed in Bristol, but he stayed in Lincoln at Osa's house (mostly) and also David Arndt's house.

Adamantine said:

Malcolm, were you by chance at an elaborate Drollo wang he gave in Lincoln, that John Petit translated? If so, would you have been wearing a striped zen? I have a vague

memory, wondering if that was you. . .

BTW, I got a copy of a translation you did for the short practice of his Drollo terma from Khenpo Sonam in LA, and the lung from his son Rigdzen Dorje Rinpoche. Thank you for your work on that.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Adamantine:

I was there. I don't think I brought a Zen to that wang. But it is a fact that I am the only western person who received the skra dbang (hair empowerment) from KDL who kept it (I was the one who requested for it, so it would have been gauche for me not to be keep it). Everyone else, for whatever reason, has cut there hair one time or another.

You are welcome. BTW. The "short" practice is actually the practice. There is another Drollo cycle in his gter kha, but it is elaborate, and is mainly used fo drubchens.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 11:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I don't find strange at all that during some periods of Tibetan history Dzogchen had to go "underground", being cloaked in Tantric robes.

There were some factions inside the schools of the new translation very hostile to Dzogchen teachings, as you know.

Adamantine said:

These are just theories, and not corresponding to the way the Nyingmapas tell their own history. I think it is just a tad disrespectful to imply that they were so influenced by sectarian anxieties that they forgot their own history and their reasons for making important decisions.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Dechen is merely repeating what ChNN has said many times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as one of his heart sons, I can say this is absolutely true.

Virgo said:

I wasn't fortunate enough to be his student, but I did stay at a house in Bristol where apparently he stayed many times when he visited Vermont.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

He never stayed in Bristol, but he stayed in Lincoln at Osa's house (mostly) and also David Arndt's house.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:19 AM

Title: Re: Question concerning Dzogchen practice of Dream Yoga.

Content:

oldbob said:

That said, I have never, in the 32 years that I have been with ChNNR, have heard him say that anyone should not study with other Teachers, or limit themselves in any way

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Transmission itself is the only blessing you need.

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Is reading The Precious Treasury... By Longchenpa a transmission ? Or only When you listen to ChNN via Webcast/or live ?

Malcolm wrote:

Reading a book is not transmission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- Is ChNN then the only exception who is convinced about the non necessity of the

preliminaries within Dzogchen?

- Are there then maybe more Dzogchen Masters (anno 2012), who share ChNN's point of view?

Mutsog Marro
KY

Virgo said:
The great Kunzang Dechen Lingpa did.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, as one of his heart sons, I can say this is absolutely true.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 10:10 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro
Content:

Adamantine said:
Well, this goes back to another thing we used to hash out on Esangha. Malcolm and others may say these Nyingma terma revelations are all just creative writings of the tertons.

Malcolm wrote:
I never said they were mere creative writings. This would mean they were products of conceptual mind.

I don't think that.

But I don't think that termas are necessarily reflective of some conventional historical factual event.

Of course the evolution of the terma tradition is poorly understood, even by Tibetans. However, if we look at the first account of the terma tradition, i.e. the one written by Guru Chowang, this can give us some clarity. Also looking at the colophons of the Vima Nyingthig and the 17 tantras, etc, will bring clarity, as well as looking at the Bonpo termas tradition which is arguably earlier than the Buddhist one.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 8:12 AM

Title: Re: What is Yeshe?

Content:

Sherab said:

If by Wisdom, you refer to the knowledge of the actual condition, then you are saying that light can be obscured by darkness or enlightened knowledge can be obscured by misknowledge. If your Wisdom refers to something else, then it is merely mundane wisdom and is of no consequence. Calling that Wisdom becomes an obfuscation.

Malcolm wrote:

Wisdom (jñāna, yeshe) is the basis.

Rigpa/sherab is knowledge of one's actual condition i.e. the basis.

Anyway, you can use whatever word you want for ye shes, timeless awakening, pristine cognition blah blah blah.

These are all just signifiers anyway and of no real consequence.

Wisdom (insert favorite jargon here i.e. Jñāna, God, Brahmin, Yeshe, George, Turiyatva etc.) is a state, i.e. the basis (sthana). It is unaffected by either knowledge or ignorance, cannot be improved or damaged, is permanent, self-originated, empty, radiant, etc., has the three kāyas, everyone possesses it, and so on -- you know the drill.

Anyway, I am tired of debating people -- -suit yourself.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 7:31 AM

Title: Re: Cleansing the physical body of bad toxins

Content:

Wesley1982 said:

What's the best way to cleanse the physical body of bad toxins? thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Colorado Cleanse

<http://www.lifespas.com> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Understanding the message of the teachings means discovering one's own true condition,

Kunga Lhadzom said:

So even if you understand, you still need a dzogchen master (living), to bless you with his realization, before your understanding is authentic ?

Malcolm wrote:

Transmission itself is the only blessing you need.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 5:07 AM

Title: Dzogchen Teaching is Free From Limitations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen teachings are neither a philosophy, nor a religious doctrine, nor a cultural tradition. Understanding the message of the teachings means discovering one's own true condition, stripped of all the self-deceptions and falsifications which the mind creates.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 123-124). Kindle Edition.

Dzogchen is not a school or sect, or a religious system. It is simply a state of knowledge which masters have transmitted beyond any limits of sect or monastic tradition.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 171-172). Kindle Edition.

A monk, without giving up his vows, can perfectly well practice Dzogchen, as can a Catholic priest, a clerk, a workman, and so on, without having to abandon their role in society, because Dzogchen does not change people from the outside.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 183-184). Kindle Edition.

Every religion, every spiritual teaching, has its basic philosophical principles, its characteristic way of seeing things. Within the philosophy of Buddhism alone, for example, there have arisen different systems and traditions, often disagreeing with each other only over subtleties of interpretation of the fundamental principles. In Tibet these philosophical controversies have lasted up until the present day, and the resulting polemical writings now form a whole body of literature in itself. But in Dzogchen no importance at all is attached to philosophical opinions and convictions. The way of seeing in Dzogchen is not based on intellectual knowledge, but on an awareness of the individual's own true condition.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 185-189). Kindle Edition.

All our concepts and beliefs, no matter how profound they may seem, are like nets which trap us in dualism. When we discover our limits we have to try to overcome them, untying ourselves from whatever type of religious, political, or social conviction may condition us.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 193-

195). Kindle Edition.

For example, those who already have a certain familiarity with Tibetan culture might think that to practice Dzogchen you have to convert to either Buddhism or Bon, because Dzogchen has been spread through these two religious traditions. This shows how limited our way of thinking is.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 161-163). Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

You are to only one using the word mandatory Dechen. I hear a lot of bitterness in you but I can't see how I have anything to do with that.

/magnus

Dechen Norbu said:

There's no bitterness here. I'm explaining what I'm doing, that's all. Can you stop guessing my mental states and intentions, please? Trying to place a negative emotional charge where there is none won't do much good for the discussion.

Adamantine said:

This is the tragedy of online communication. . . (you've done this to me a bunch lately too Dechen, and I am sure I'm guilty as well!) Maybe we all need to realize internet communication is tone-deaf and do our best to give everyone's intentions and moods the benefit of the doubt. Let's at the very least assume everyone's motivation is altruistic in the sense of trying to benefit others through personal experience and clarifying aspects of teachings according to each person's given understanding. Naturally, this will be different for each person, -for so many reasons!

Malcolm wrote:

Come on man, it is really simple -- we DC people know what ChNN teaches, and we are constantly told we are wrong.

This is an old story and it goes back to E-Sangha days. It is a skipping CD.

Do we know that there is Dzogchen outside of the DC, of course. But the fact remains that the way our teacher teaches really is quite different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Energetics of Thought

Content:

underthetree said:

Something I've found, both in meditation and in everyday life is that, when a thought arises and I look at it and let it dissolve, I always experience a physical sensation, either in the area of my heart, my solar plexus or occasionally roughly in my sinuses. The same applies for emotion. This is a sort of faint physical tremor or thrill accompanied by a sensation which is neither pleasant or unpleasant. From my limited understanding of Tibetan esoteric physiology I'm guessing that this is a function or manifestation of lung, but I'd like to know more.

Malcolm wrote:

Thoughts are rlung. When your lung does not move, thoughts do not arise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Question concerning Dzogchen practice of Dream Yoga.

Content:

Jacob said:

but what can he teach me that e.g. ChNNR can't?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing. He is teaching dream yoga from the perspective of Kagyu. While it is a fine teaching, it has nothing to do with the practice of the night as taught by ChNN.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

In general it is an anti-intellectual, hedonistically oriented, aggressive monoculture.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh bullshit.

kirtu said:

I'm surprised by your flight to ad hominem and illogic. Please calm yourself.

One solution would be for you to spend 3-5 years in Western Europe outside of a strictly American environment. You might not agree with me, but the arguments would make more sense to you.

Malcolm wrote:

I have spent a lot of time in Europe. I like Europe.

kirtu said:

However my argument is with all of western culture as a font of death and misery.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh please.

kirtu said:

I am not advocating religious government.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the only way your Dharmic society will happen.

Unless of course you agree with my perspective of individual evolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Real Marijuana as Herbal Medicine?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't practice, herb is fine. If you do, herb is a fetter.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

In general it is an anti-intellectual, hedonistically oriented, aggressive monoculture.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh bullshit.

kirtu said:

US citizens do not understand that they are basically a monoculture and certainly deny it. One of the reasons is that US people largely have not experienced other societies.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not a monoculture at all. Seriously, kirt, get over your trip.

kirtu said:

I'm stunned that you could assert that US culture is not superficial intellectually. Just look at the level of "discussion" on various topics in the US on most levels.

Malcolm wrote:

You watch too much goddamn TV.

kirtu said:

As far as TV, I don't experience societies through TV.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the only way you can come to your conclusion.

Again, your top down approach is totalitarian. I prefer American Democracy along with all its warts and mistakes.

Once again, it's not a top down approach and I am not advocating totalitarianism. This is at least the second time in two forums that you have accused me of totalitarianism and that is highly offensive.

Right, just as offensive as the bullshit you have been spewing in this thread, if you don't like America, than move.

AFAIC, any religious government will ultimately result in totalitarianism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

IMHO,

The Diamond Sutra is a Dzogchen teaching. Also The Heart Sutra. Any teaching on Emptiness really...no ?

Malcolm wrote:

Indirectly, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

"An oral commentary to Narag Tontrug" page 11: "In fact the Manjushri Tantra, which contains many oral transmissions and teachings, was taught by Shakyamuni through particular manifestations, and through these teachings he transmitted knowledge and understanding of the state of Dzogchen"

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, that is quite different. Mañjuśrī nāmasaṃgiti is not a Dzogchen tantra, and can be understood in many different ways. That being said, there are passages in the Nāmasaṃgiti which show up in Dzogchen tantras, such as "The single eye of wisdom is stainless".

But you will never find Sakyamuni giving a teaching on Dzogchen in an explicit way.

heart said:

This is an exact quote.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know. Nevertheless, ChNN also maintains that Shakyamuni never taught Dzogchen explicitly. I have heard him say it any number time. Man you are stubborn.

It is getting to the fraking point on this board that unless you come armed with a volume of fraking citations you cannot say anything.

Kunsanggar, June 1st, 2001:

"Buddha Shakyamuni did not directly teach Dzogchen. Not only Buddha Sakyamuni, but some of the other twelve teachers did not directly give Dzogchen teachings. They communicated indirectly because the essence of their teaching is Dzogchen."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, point of protocol, it is either Chogyal Namkhai Norbu or Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche. If you use one you do not need the other.

What do you mean: 1) ChNN says that Shakyamuni taught Dzogchen 2) he predicted

Garab Dorje?

heart said:

What is wrong with calling him "the precious Dharma King Namkhai Norbu"?

For the rest, see above.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing, it simply is not necessary. His formal title is Chogyal, that is more proper than "Rinpoche". You could call him Chogyal Rinpoche, which is how he was known in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Who taught Shakyamuni dzogchen?

The 11th Ngöndzok Gyalpo ?

Did Shakyamuni receive pointing out from Ngondzok ?

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Bonpos, Shakyamuni received Dzogchen teachings from Shenrab when the former incarnated as Sangba Dupa.

But in a way that is a wrong question, Shakyamuni did not need anyone to give him transmission since he was a nirmanakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

ChNNR says he did.

/magnus

Dechen Norbu said:

Sources, please.

heart said:

"An oral commentary to Narag Tontrug" page 11: "In fact the Manjushri Tantra, which contains many oral transmissions and teachings, was taught by Shakyamuni through particular manifestations, and through these teachings he transmitted knowledge and

understanding of the state of Dzogchen"

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, that is quite different. Mañjuśrī nāmasaṃgiti is not a Dzogchen tantra, and can be understood in many different ways. That being said, there are passages in the Nāmasaṃgiti which show up in Dzogchen tantras, such as "The single eye of wisdom is stainless".

But you will never find Sakyamuni giving a teaching on Dzogchen in an explicit way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Twelve_teachers Even Buddha Sakyamuni is considered a dzogchen teacher !

Malcolm wrote:

yes, though he did not teach any Dzogchgen texts directly, he predicted Garab Dorje.

heart said:

ChNNR says he did.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, point of protocol, it is either Chogyal Namkhai Norbu or Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche. If you use one you do not need the other.

What do you mean: 1) ChNN says that Shakyamuni taught Dzogchen 2) he predicted Garab Dorje?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Twelve_teachers Even Buddha Sakyamuni is considered a dzogchen teacher !

Malcolm wrote:

yes, though he did not teach any Dzogchen texts directly, he predicted Garab Dorje.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

When and where did dzogchen begin?

Wasn't it taught in other parts of the Universe before coming to Earth ?

Who was the first teacher in the Universe ?

Malcolm wrote:

1) Dzogchen teachings are primordial, they have no beginning. They arise out of the very fabric of reality.

2) Dzogchen is mentioned in the sgra thal gyur tantra to have been taught in 13 other places besides this one.

3) The first teacher of Dzogchen in this great eonic cycle is usually considered to be Nangwa Dampa, the first of the 12 primordial masters, who taught all the man ngage sde tantras including the primary root tantra of Dzogchen, the sgra thal gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 18th, 2012 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Bhusuku said:

One quick question: What is actually the earliest source for the Ngöndro practice, and how old is that source?

Malcolm wrote:

Ngondro as a formal set of practices developed in Tibet between the 11th and 13th century. You will find no Ngondro texts in the bstan 'gyur.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Pero said:

Yudron was saying what is needed for accomplishment, and I'd say turning oneself into a qualified student (not just being an interested one) is a good part of that.

Malcolm wrote:

She does not use the word accomplishment once in her post. So I did not read it that way.

Pero said:

She does, you missed it:

Yudron said:

...but I've heard that accomplishment is based on 1) Having a qualified guru (someone who has brought his or her Dzogchen practice to culmination, this has been verified by his/her teacher, and who has been asked to teach Dzogchen based on this). 2) Being a qualified disciple (we skip over this part, don't we?) 3) Having pure view of one's guru. 4) Actually practicing daily.

Malcolm wrote:

I stand corrected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

There's also a point I forgot to comment and I think it deserves a little discussion. The bold part:

Yudron said:

It's really not a big deal, and it is pretty enjoyable. So, there is no need to take 20 years to avoid something that takes three or four years. Especially in the west where we are probably not even Buddhists before ngondro, we need at least that long to reorient to a Buddhist framework.

Dechen Norbu said:

The question is, does this Buddhist framework is really necessary for a Dzogchen practitioner?

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not for Father Francis Tiso.

And here we go again...

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

You are right Malcom, I am sorry.

Now do you understand that all of this isn't helping?

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on who you ask. It may not be helpful for you, which means you should put it aside.

In the bone yard said:

Please just remember that there are members on this board who do take their practice seriously and that your actions effect others.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am quite aware of both things. What I do and say here is quite deliberate and not whimsical. I have to say your stalking of my posts on the board with your unwelcome and anonymous admonishments is becoming quite tiresome. Talk to someone who is interested.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Pero said:

Yudron was saying what is needed for accomplishment, and I'd say turning oneself into a qualified student (not just being an interested one) is a good part of that.

Malcolm wrote:

She does not use the word accomplishment once in her post. So I did not read it that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I am 50 now and I am not as sharp as I was when I was younger but I guess its better late than never.

Malcolm wrote:

Sharp and dull is of no consequence on Dzogchen. The only thing that matters is personal experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: I thought Buddhism wasn't about threatening people with Hell

Content:

Ikkyu said:

From what I understand, Madhyamaka is about finding balance in everything.

Anders said:

That's not really what Madhyamika, or the middle way in general, is about. It's just about steering clear of the extremes. In Madhyamika, that means the extremes of existence and non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, Ikkyu, you are talking about the Madhyamā pratipad i.e. the middle way path:

Monks, these two extremes ought not to be practiced by one who has gone forth from the household life. (What are the two?) There is addiction to indulgence of sense-pleasures, which is low, coarse, the way of ordinary people, unworthy, and unprofitable; and there is addiction to self-mortification, which is painful, unworthy, and unprofitable.

Avoiding both these extremes, the Tathagata (the Perfect One) has realized the Middle Path; it gives vision, gives knowledge, and leads to calm, to insight, to enlightenment and to Nibbana. And what is that Middle Path realized by the Tathagata...? It is the Noble Eightfold path, and nothing else, namely: right understanding, right thought, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness and right concentration

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

I said nothing about imposing a totalitarian system at all. I did say we need to create a Dharmic culture. Right now and basically forever, the US, as an example, is blind to the consequences of it's culture.

Malcolm wrote:

No we aren't.

kirtu said:

US culture permits (and in some view , insists upon) state murder (execution). This is a consequence of the culture. US culture also permits the blunt use of military force because it is a non-reflective culture

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this assessment.

kirtu said:

and as we have seen when a form of mass hysteria arises as a result of some severe trauma (9/11 and the partially justified view that terrorist want to kill everyone) indiscriminate military force is applied.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, and this isn't also happening in Europe? Haven't you noticed burgeoning rise of the far right in European politics -- did it escape your attention that Nato is involved in every war we have been in?

kirtu said:

One of the reasons that both are possible is the lack of compassion as a serious motivation in the society and from an intellectual POV the intense superficiality of the society, resulting in a tendency to not consider consequences or alternatives.

Malcolm wrote:

The American society I live in is not superficial, intellectually or otherwise. You need to read folks like Wendell Berry, etc. I honestly think you have not explored American culture beyond what you see on TV even though you have lived here your whole life.

kirtu said:

Certainly the bedrock values of a Dharmic culture would be compassion and the sanctity of life. These values are certainly no where near the core values of society, not even social democracies at this point.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, your top down approach is totalitarian. I prefer American Democracy along with all its warts and mistakes.

kirtu said:

However, people can follow Dharma as best they can, and they can be "mini-cultures". Evolution, as my teacher says, not revolution -- one person at a time. That is certainly true but people also need to begin to change society to move it in a compassionate direction.

Malcolm wrote:

If and when people evolve, society will evolve, and not before.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

In an attempt to solve this situation, this topic was created.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just a rerun of conversations held at E-Sangha, with exactly the same players.

We are like old men in Miami arguing about a Dodgers game we both saw in the '50's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

We create an enlightenment culture, a Dharmic culture

Malcolm wrote:

We need to become integrated persons, then the rest will happen naturally. There is no way to create a top-down culture of the kind you envision, and I wouldn't want it anyway.

Why? Whose vision of Dharma are we to follow? Buddhists can't even agree on that (one of the reasons I don't consider myself a Buddhist anymore, after all, just what is Buddhism other than a demographic label?). No, the whole idea of a "Dharmic" culture is problematical and ultimately, totalitarian.

However, people can follow Dharma as best they can, and they can be "mini-cultures". Evolution, as my teacher says, not revolution -- one person at a time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

The 4 Aspects of the Attainment of Freedom in Dzogchen is the same as the Basis of Purification in tantric scripture.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis of purification in Vajrayāna depends. In Lamdre for example, in general it is the five aggregates, etc. that is given as the basis of purification.

That is not the basis of purification in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

You are right Malcom, I am sorry.

Now do you understand that all of this isn't helping?

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on who you ask. It may not be helpful for you, which means you should put it aside.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

I agree Yudron, this whole discussion stems from a few people here having a Guru that says it isn't necessary for them to do Ngondro or Yidam and for some reason they translate that personal instruction to a universal truth that defines Dzogchen as a teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

That's because this is what that Guru tells them is universally true about Dzogchen as presented in the original tantras of Dzogchen, which is the perspective from which he teaches.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Yudron said:

2) Being a qualified disciple (we skip over this part, don't we?)

Malcolm wrote:

If you have met Dzogchen teachings, you are a qualified disciple, in so far as you interested in practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: What is Yeshe?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ye shes is Dzogchen.

Sherab said:

Is Dzogchen neutral with regard to Wisdom? i.e. Dzogchen is Dzogchen whether Wisdom is present or not? If yes, then since Ye shes is Dzog chen, then Ye shes is ye shes whether Wisdom is present or not. If so, then using Wisdom in the translation of Ye shes would be inappropriate.

Malcolm wrote:

Wisdom is always present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 7:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

That is nice Malcom, but you didn't say it.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I did. I said it to you.

In the bone yard said:

You are a Buddha.

---Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh Lectures

Hey Malcom,

I am a Buddha!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are. Now act like one and stop giving me a hard time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Virgo said:

Kirt, what do you propose we do about this so-called "problem of culture"?

kirtu said:

We create an enlightenment culture, a Dharmic culture, in which communal murder for one (and that's not the only thing, BTW) becomes as impossible as possible. So a Dharmic Swedish culture of sorts. And we change culture worldwide over a several century period to reflect this Dharmic culture. This is not imposed on top of local culture per se but aspects of local culture are diminished that would lead to negative action and aspects of local culture that promote peace and kindness are enhanced. So over time, all cultures become bodhisattvic in their own way.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism does not have good record in this department. There is nothing about any Buddhist culture which suggests a commitment to peace and kindness other verbal lip service.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

The cultures of all societies are harmful.]

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I don't share your cynicism. But you're more interested in being "right" than sharing perspectives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they are related in the terms of goal how could they be independent of each other? My understanding of the word "independent" is something like "unrelated".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

In the same way that three different roads are independent and lead to the same

destination. But, you can only travel one road at a time.

heart said:

Perhaps in terms of view but concerning methods that would mean that you are limiting yourself.

Going to bed now, see you tomorrow!

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

View is what is being considered here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: Invocation of Samantabhadra

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I know that ChNNR is giving a retreat for this in LA next week. What is its purpose? How is it used/practiced?

Malcolm wrote:

It is an essential teaching on the basis, and how ignorance happens and what to do about it in the form of a beautiful aspiration. It comes from a long tantra from the Gongpa Zangthal cycle

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they are related in the terms of goal how could they be independent of each other? My understanding of the word "independent" is something like "unrelated".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

In the same way that three different roads are independent and lead to the same destination. But, you can only travel one road at a time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

That is nice Malcom, but you didn't say it.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I did. I said it to you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they were truly independent why would you need to use renunciation and transformation to explain self-liberation?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

They are contrasted so one can understand the difference between them, why they are different, how they are different, etc.

heart said:

If they lack relation in terms of goal it makes no sense to differentiate them.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

They are related in terms of goal, that is the point of differentiating them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they were truly independent why would you need to use renunciation and transformation to explain self-liberation? Why would Kunjed Gyalpo go on and on about why Dzogchen is superior to the Mahayoga and Anuyoga?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen takes a critical posture towards the eight yanas (even the nine yanas), just as Vajrayāna takes a critical posture towards Mahayāna, and Mahāyāna, a critical posture towards hinayāna.

M

heart said:

Yes, exactly.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and in contrast to the approaches of these eight or nine yāna, Dzogchen presents its own independent approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

If they were truly independent why would you need to use renunciation and transformation to explain self-liberation?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

They are contrasted so one can understand the difference between them, why they are different, how they are different, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think Dzogchen is not independent of Vajrayāna?

heart said:

Depends on what you mean by independent, Dzogchen is always presented as a part of Vajrayana. "I am Manjusrimitra, who have attained the siddhi of Yamantaka." Anyway, nothing in this world is independent.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

What I mean by independent is that Dzogchen has its unique approach. It does not mean that Dzogchen cannot be approached through mahā and anuyoga; it can; but it also has its own approach. Thus my Guru has said, and likewise my reading in early Dzogchen tantras bear this out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

Oh, and I am pretty bored with this discussion because nothing new ever appears in it.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

renunciation

transformation

self-liberation

Three different paths, independent of each other.

M

heart said:

If they were truly independent why would you need to use renunciation and transformation to explain self-liberation? Why would Kunjed Gyalpo go on and on about why Dzogchen is superior to the Mahayoga and Anuyoga?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen takes a critical posture towards the eight yanas (even the nine yanas), just as Vajrayāna takes a critical posture towards Mahayāna, and Mahāyāna, a critical posture towards hinayāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

If we are low intellect we cannot expect to understand and practice Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

If this is practiced, all will be liberated;

there is no distinction between sharpness and dullness in capacities.

--- Flight of the Garuda

There are many other citations to similar effect. If you have the good fortune to meet Dzogchen, you can practice it and achieve liberation, regardless of who you are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

Oh, and I am pretty bored with this discussion because nothing new ever appear in it.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

renunciation

transformation

self-liberation

Three different paths, independent of each other.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

heart said:

There is no "pure Dzogchen" it is a pipe dream.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are practices which come from the three series which are independent. They can be mixed with practices from the lower yanas or not.

How many more rounds do you want to fight until you get bored with it?

heart said:

Instead of just claiming Dzogchen is completely and fully independent of Vajrayana, how about you try to prove it? I have seen no proofs at all yet.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Do you think Dzogchen is not independent of Vajrayāna?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

mutsum said:

No, not in the Nyingthiks.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the Vima Nyinthig this is exactly how it is and how it is laid out in the shal chems in the gser yig can.

This changes with the introduction of the klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma rgyud which most likely dates to early-mid thirteenth century.

heart said:

The "klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma rgyud" is not real Dzogchen? Is that what you are saying?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It explains why there is a difference between the kama tradition on this point and the terma tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Well, going straight to Rushen, Trekcho, etc. straight from Direct Introduction is traditional for pure Dzogchen.

And doing Ngondro before Rushen, Trekcho, etc. is traditional for Dzogchen integrated with lower Yanas.

And both ways are perfectly fine, and are also both "traditional" in their own way, yes?

heart said:

There is no "pure Dzogchen" it is a pipe dream.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are practices which come from the three series which are independent. They can be mixed with practices from the lower yanas or not.

How many more rounds do you want to fight until you get bored with it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, he said "direct introduction". Why? Because in Dzogchen Buddhahood exists to be demonstrated. If it is not demonstrated, there is no liberation, even though it is present from the beginning.

heart said:

Exactly, and how do that happen? There are no rules, so stop pretending that there is.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Did I say anything about rules? Mutsuk was making a claim, proposing that there was always a sutra and Vajrayāna style ngondro attached to Dzogchen teachings and that this is evident in Nyinthig. Well, it is evident in Khandro Nyinthig tradition, but is not evident in the early 12th century Vima Nyinthig tradition. Even in the third Karmapa's commentary on the Vima Nyinthig, it is the seven mind trainings that are offered, unlike Kongtrul's large commentary on the Mother and son Nyinthigs, which has a standard ngondro attached.

After all, if you have confidence in the teachings, believe in your guru, and have compassion, what more do you need?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jacob said:

Yeah, i always wonder if this white A is in sphere or it is flat. I asked some elder practitioners and i got two different answers. I think it doesn't matter ;p

Malcolm wrote:

It is in a thigle i.e. a sphere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and ngöndro

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Well, going straight to Rushen, Trekcho, etc. straight from Direct Introduction is traditional for pure Dzogchen.

mutsuk said:

No, not in the Nyingthiks.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in the Vima Nyinthig this is exactly how it is and how it is laid out in the shal chems in the gser yig can.

This changes with the introduction of the klong gsal nyi ma 'bar ma rgyud which most likely dates to early-mid thirteenth century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mutsuk said:

Therefore, the main way Dzogchen is being taught is through a traditional approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, everywhere but the DC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mutsuk said:

This is the purpose of the direct introduction. As Vimalamitra says at the beginning of his 1st volume commentary on the Dra Thelgyur, the Path of Dzogchen consists of the gradual steps explained in this Tantra. This involves ordinary preliminaries, etc, together

with Rushen, etc., and of course the four Visions.

Malcolm wrote:
Page numbers?

I am looking at that section, and it starts with rushan following receiving the four empowerments. But I don't see refuge, mandala, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:45 AM
Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen
Content:
mutsuk said:
but its a gradual path anyway.

Malcolm wrote:
As I said, we will agree to disagree.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:08 AM
Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen
Content:
Dechen Norbu said:
heart,

I'll quote Malcom as this reply of his fits your comments about using the traditional ngöndro to get rid of doubt.

More, SMS base level is not particularly related to Garab Dorje's second statement.

heart said:
So it is connected with his first statement? Seem so you didn't get my point, what practice you do don't necessary correspond with any of the the three statements so I think when ChNNR says that Garab Dorje didn't say "first do the Ngondro" that is just a joke because for sure he didn't say "first do Guru Yoga with a white Ah" either nor did he say "first do lodjongs, semdzins and rushan" or "first do Semde" or any other method at all. It is between you and your Guru what you do and when.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
No, he said "direct introduction". Why? Beause in Dzogchen Buddhahood exists to be

demonstrated. If it is not demonstrated, there is no liberation, even though it is present from the beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 17th, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mutsuk said:

To the extent that there is a path in Dzogchen, that path consists of discovering what you have not discovered.

Malcolm wrote:

Not only, it deals with becoming familiar with what you were not. The DC usually forget about the Tsel of Rigpa and the related practice.

[/quote]

As for your first sentence, this is a quibble.

As for the second part, No, you are wrong.

mutsuk said:

This is the reason for the special preliminaries as I am sure you will agree.

Yes sure, but not only, these preliminaries have purposes too.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, a given practice can have ultimate as well as temporary benefits.

mutsuk said:

So, there is a path to discovering this knowledge, but it is not really gradual in the sense of gathering the two accumulations and so on as in sutra and tantra.

The understanding is not gradual, nobody said so. But it takes an entire life to become so familiar with the dynamic nature of the state to reach its ultimate expression. So it's gradual. Those who went from the 1st to the 4th vision are more than quite rare in the entire history of Dzogchen. For the 99,99 per cent remaining, including gigantically advanced masters, there is a path to follow. This Path is explained in the entire Dzogchen literature and it's its purpose. Any Path is gradual, even terribly abrupt ones. This is why Trekcho is a View and Thogel a Meditation (or a Path depending on authors).

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone can have the first vision. Most people manage the second vision with relative ease. Many, though less, even manage the third.

For example, the Rigpa Rangshar has a detailed presentation of the 21 capacities. Only

the best of the best achieve the body of light in this lifetime. Most of the rest achieve buddhahood in the bardo after varying length of time after death. The rest take rebirth in the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels.

The energy of the wisdom of rigpa neither increases nor does it decrease regardless of the four visions.

The "path" in Dzogchen is not like "path" in other systems, where you start out from point a and wind up at point b. The "path" of Dzogchen is simple removing the jaundice of ignorance so you see what is there all along from the beginning. It is not about acquiring something new you did have before.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

However, it is not a gradual approach. Nothing in Dzogchen is gradual. If it is gradual, it is not Dzogchen, even if it is useful.

mutuk said:

It is indeed a gradual approach compared to the way other lamas teach this Testament. Moreover, everything that has a Path is gradual. You must not conflate Dzogchen and the Dzogchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

It is best if we agree to disagree.

It could only be gradual if you consider sems sde gradual (it isn't). Instead, it is scheme outlining the intention of the three series in very broad strokes.

Dzogchen is a kind of knowledge: you either have it or you don't. To the extent that there is a path in Dzogchen, that path consists of discovering what you have not discovered. This is the reason for the special preliminaries as I am sure you will agree.

So, there is a path to discovering this knowledge, but it is not really gradual in the sense of gathering the two accumulations and so on as in sutra and tantra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

More, SMS base level is not particularly related to Garab Dorje's second statement.

mitsuk said:

Garab Dorje's Testament is strictly an Upadesha, as can be seen in the commentaries by Dza Patrul and others. This is not a text dealing with Semde or Longde. Only ChNN Rinpoche interprets it as a gradual approach to Dzogchen. This is not the case with any other master alive or in the past. I don't mean it's wrong, it's just simply not the case. His gradual approach to the Testament of Garab Dorje is not the traditional one.

Malcolm wrote:

That is correct, ChNN clearly states that his equation of the three statements with sems sde, klong sde, and man ngag sde is based on his dreams and is not an explanation one will find in any other master's teachings.

However, it is not a gradual approach. Nothing in Dzogchen is gradual. If it is gradual, it is not Dzogchen, even if it is useful.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Copyrighted Dharma books

Content:

LastLegend said:

Every translation is someone's intellectual property. However, there are movements to make everything available for free on the web, like the following:

<http://84000.co/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

What is intellectual property?

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intellectual_property " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Copyrighted Dharma books

Content:

LastLegend said:

Right. What about teachings that are not intellectual properties?

Malcolm wrote:

Every translation is someone's intellectual property. However, there are movements to make everything available for free on the web, like the following:

<http://84000.co/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Copyrighted Dharma books

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha also did not need to get paid, he left his family and had no one to support. He lived under trees, did not have a mortgage, wrote nothing down, did not distribute books, etc.

LastLegend said:

True. It is understandable that printing books cost money, and people need to make a living. But why copyrighted?

Malcolm wrote:

Because a lot of things written about buddhism are people's own intellectual property.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

Sönam said:

Rinpoché says different things at different moments. One take what he hears at the moment he hears it ... btw, have you noticed that the secrecy is only sealed by a member ship payment.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Sonam:

While what you say is true, in general Dzogchen is not "secret"; ChNN also regularly reminds people that Dzogchen practices are not to be shared with people who do not have the proper transmission. "Secret" and samaya are different. "Secret" means that no one should know. Samaya means that you can discuss with people who have same transmission. "rgya rgya rgya" means that you should maintain the samaya of body, of speech, and of mind with regard to the teachings. It just means to take care to not share them with people who are not interested, to not think to do so, speak about them, or show them with your body.

But "samaya" does not mean "secret" -- it comes from two words "sam + yama" -- it

really means "keeping perfect discipline".

M

Sönam said:

Thank you for precision ... also I don't think I have really made such a mistake. I don't think that to consider my short answer to someone having followed the concerned teachings could be considered as a failure of my samaya. Anyway I will try to be more attentive next time.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Sonam:

I was not criticizing you -- I was trying to bring some clarity to the issue of "secret" as opposed to what is appropriate to share. I think in general people in Dzogchen confuse the idea with "secret" with samaya. There is very little in Dzogchen that is "secret" unlike tantric practices. There are many things in Vajrayāna that are secret in a concrete way. But it is not like that in Dzogchen. So we are in broad agreement. I just wanted to clarify that while Dzogchen is not secret, we still have samaya not to share things with people who are not interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Copyrighted Dharma books

Content:

LastLegend said:

I don't mean to upset people with this post at all. But lately it came to me that Buddha had taught Dharma for 49 years of his life, but he never claimed that what he taught came from him. Today, there are Dharma books that have personal copyrights that require permission from the publishers or writers for redistribution. Should Dharma teachings be freely available to all sentient beings? Please shed some lights and share your thoughts.

Keep in mind that I am not saying copyrighted Dharma books are not helpful. I hope I am not upsetting anyone.

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha also did not need to get paid, he left his family and had no one to support. He

lived under trees, did not have a mortgage, wrote nothing down, did not distribute books, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Apologies all. This is the DC thread. Yes you are right Mariusz.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Andrew:

Yes, what you have said is more or less what ChNN has said many times.

With one caveat, there really is a potentiality of the five elements within our body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

Sönam said:

Rinpoché says different things at different moments. One take what he hears at the moment he hears it ... btw, have you noticed that the secrecy is only sealed by a member ship payment.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Sonam:

While what you say is true, in general Dzogchen is not "secret"; ChNN also regularly reminds people that Dzogchen practices are not to be shared with people who do not have the proper transmission. "Secret" and samaya are different. "Secret" means that no one should know. Samaya means that you can discuss with people who have same transmission. "rgya rgya rgya" means that you should maintain the samaya of body, of speech, and of mind with regard to the teachings. It just means to take care to not share them with people who are not interested, to not think to do so, speak about them, or show them with your body.

But "samaya" does not mean "secret" -- it comes from two words "sam + yama" -- it really means "keeping perfect discipline".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: What is Yeshe?

Content:

Sherab said:

Yeshe + Rigpa of Dzogpa Chenpo = Sherab of Dzogpa Chenpo

Therefore the use of Wisdom in translating Yeshe seems inappropriate.

What then is Yeshe?

It is that which has the ability to perceive Dzogpa Chenpo.

A Yeshe that has not perceive Dzogpa Chenpo is the mundane mind.

What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, shes rab and rig pa are basically synonymous.

Ye shes is Dzogchen.

A rig pa that has not recognized ye shes is ma rig pa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mutsum said:

Since nearly all Dzogchen texts state that you have to have accomplished Ngöndro before and have to perform your training in the main teaching (trekcho and thogel) in retreat, I know where I have to establish my trust.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it sure does not say this in any of the three series of Dzogchen tantras (of which I have thus far read). I put my trust in the original Dzogchen tantras.

If people want to follow masters that teach in the established traditional way, they can and ought to if it feels right for them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: some questions about dzogchen

Content:

mutsum said:

[EDIT: mutsum's off topic comments removed] As Malcolm have told you before, JLA's description of the traditional Dzogchen curriculum (in his book on Khenpo Gangshar) is the same as that of SMS. JLA is not forwarding his own program as you claim everywhere but the traditional program. Period. Or you have to concede that Yongdzin Rinpoche and many other masters are not qualified, serious, etc., in your own view. But hey, how long have you been into Dzogchen and still not distinguish the state and the individual ?

Malcolm wrote:

While it is true that in SMS there is a gradual way proceeding in the base and the first level, it is hyper-abbreviated compared to the traditional approach, the emphasis being on gaining experience in each of the topics. The practice amounts recommended are just recommendations, with a minimum of a week for somethings, and a day for other things.

But the important thing to remember is that SMS is not mandatory, and everything that ChNN teaches in SMS he also teaches in other contexts. SMS was originally designed for teacher training -- and is a comprehensive approach to the various systems found in Dzogchen.

Also, his longsal cycle is a completely different -- and is not connected with SMS at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 16th, 2012 at 1:09 PM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When we talk about preserving culture, we are talking about music, art, crafts, literature, sciences, medicine, healing traditions, etc., the things that make human life wonderful and diverse.

We are not talking about preserving deviant or exploitative social and economic phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Ogyen said:

I wonder why this list specifically and not other animals...? And was this purely for the Vinaya (part of their many vows?) or for lay persons as well?

Huseng said:

In the case of elephant flesh, the elephant King Bimbisāra died and the low caste butchers went to go eat it, along with a few monks. Some people asked the Buddha about this and the rule against eating elephant flesh was established. In the case of vultures, as the story goes the monks ate some vulture meat and a bunch of them followed them into the woods, squawking at them, whereupon the Buddha then banned the consumption of vulture flesh.

It was a case by case basis.

Human flesh was apparently used in medicine.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything can be medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

Thanks. Yes, I know that is what Rinpoche said. I am just wondering if that emptiness is the same emptiness as one of the three experiences of body, speech and mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Not the same.

Clarence said:

Thank you Malcolm-la. Guess this whole Rigpa thing isn't so easy as it seems in the beginning.

Malcolm wrote:

The experience of emptiness is a state free from thought.

Ka dag emptiness is a fundamental feature of the basis, it is the emptiness discussed in madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sönam said:

Rinpoché says

"Non dual of Kadhag and Lundhrub is Dzogchen. Kadhag means, emptiness since the beginning pure. Lundhrub means it has infinite potentiality ... and non dual you have to discover "

Sönam

Clarence said:

Thanks. Yes, I know that is what Rinpoche said. I am just wondering if that emptiness is the same emptiness as one of the three experiences of body, speech and mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Not the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: @DalaiLama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

@DalaiLama

I am increasingly convinced that the time has come to find a way of thinking about spirituality and ethics beyond religion altogether.

Huifeng said:

Great.

But, what does he mean by "religion", "spirituality" and "ethics", exactly?

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Religion -- Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, etc.

Spirituality -- compassion, kindness, love, openness

Ethics -- valuing life

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

Witch burning...

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No, witches emerged from pagan European culture, but because the Church wanted to control medicine, they instituted a program against healers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

Well this is just a fact.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is your opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

So the better aspects of culture can eventually trump evolutionary impulses.

Malcolm wrote:

Your arguments are not about culture, they are about crimes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

Like most Americans you want to ignore serious issues and hope they go away. Of course this isn't just an American issue but many western Europeans are prepared to engage on these issues after a beer or two.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a very chauvanistic attitude.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Sönam said:

You're possibly right at the end of the bill. But women have also been preserved from such oppressions as war, responsibilities and a long list of others delikatessen of the kind ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe in the upper classes but not in the lower classes (hint, there are more of them).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

kirtu said:

What in these examples is praiseworthy and worth preserving?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot sum up a whole culture in its faults. That is rather racist.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

conebeckham said:

Perhaps the question should better be "in what human culture(s) are females NOT oppressed, as compared to males?"

Precious few, I think.

Sönam said:

It depends how you view oppression. I think thousands years of male education have created some habituation that men have to deal with ... and it's not easy for them. I can

easily compare that man's oppression to the woman's oppression, and I'm not sure which one is the heaviest ... if even there is one heaviest.

Sönarn

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, women's.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 2:13 AM
Title: Re: Nakedness
Content:

oldbob said:
Me thinks ye are hoist by your own petard,

Malcolm wrote:
I never offer instructions here, only opinions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 1:28 AM
Title: Re: Nakedness
Content:

oldbob said:
My offering of a non-verbal experience in a simple practice, is a non-verbal way of possibly answering that question.

Malcolm wrote:
I am pretty certain he told you he was not interested.

oldbob said:
Malcolm,

Respectfully,

"Eat a nectarine it's the best fruit ever made."

Respectfully,

ob

Malcolm wrote:
Bob:

When someone asks you teach, then you teach, in a proper way, in a proper place, at a proper time.

Otherwise, offering unasked for instructions is a mistake.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 15th, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

oldbob said:

My offering of a non-verbal experience in a simple practice, is a non-verbal way of possibly answering that question.

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty certain he told you he was not interested.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

oldbob said:

Mia Culpa, please forgive me.

Malcolm wrote:

Bob,

Sharing instructions no one asked for is a little strange.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 10:55 PM

Title: @DalaiLama

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

@DalaiLama

I am increasingly convinced that the time has come to find a way of thinking about spirituality and ethics beyond religion altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: George W Bush in Game of Thrones

Content:

Clarence said:

At 1:10 his head is on a stake.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the profile, slight resemblance, I guess.

M

Clarence said:

Yeah, that's it. There is some ruckus about it. Apparently the DVD has extras where they explained they used Bush's head because their budget was too strained to make new ones every time.

Malcolm wrote:

Hilarious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: George W Bush in Game of Thrones

Content:

Clarence said:

At 1:10 his head is on a stake.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the profile, slight resemblance, I guess.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: George W Bush in Game of Thrones

Content:

Clarence said:

Who would have thought:

```
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]

Not very cool but interesting on how little we notice really.

Malcolm wrote:

Not seeing it...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Uncertain Minds: How the West Misunderstands Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

By the way:

Murthugpa = Barhaspatya

Malcolm wrote:

Where is your source for this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR - pricing and costing issues

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Afterwards is the profit counted.....

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Dzogchen Community.

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

That is what i do believe blindfolded.

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

You do not understand how things work in the DC, nor should you presume too. But the fact is that profit is not a motive on any level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR - pricing and costing issues

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Afterwards is the profit counted.....

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Dzogchen Community.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

Sally Gross said:

I wonder whether Rigdzin Changchub Dorje's gar, in which each would seem to have given according to ability and to have received according to need, is not a model which underpins the constitution of the Dzogchen Community fostered by Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the model for the community.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Zhang Zhung and Garab Dorje

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

For me personal Rigpa is Awareness like preferred in Bon and Nyingma and not Knowledge like translated in ChNN's DC.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, rig pa is just a word. You either understand what it means or you don't.

M

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

The whole Dharma does consist out of only words.
It is the meaning of those words which is important but also the correct use of it.

Malcolm wrote:
what is important is the meaning behind the words.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:56 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Bob:

You have been complaining about this issue for years. The fact is that there are options for people if they seek them out. There are disability/low income memberships.

Media costs money to produce.

I happen to know for a fact that the financial policies in the DC come directly from ChNN. When you complain about the money, you are complaining about the boss.

M

oldbob said:
Respectfully, nope.

The Boss is Perfect, and whatever he does is Perfect (my mother right or wrong) but working with circumstances, allows himself to be conditioned by the people advising him. Some people say this has been less than perfect, for the Dzogchen Community. Sure you can say, "It's not so bad" and "it could be a lot worse," and while true, DOESN'T HELP ANYONE FROM MOLDOVA.

How often do the members of the International Gaykil change? Did you ever try to collaborate on the "Collaboration" website? Maybe as the Community evolves, the advisors, and advice, could evolve too.

Respectfully,

ob

Malcolm wrote:
Bob, you are aware that the pricing structure of memberships and so on for people in

Eastern Europe and Russia is completely different than for Western Europeans?

Tashigar South is cheaper than Tsegylgar?

Anyway, it is best we not be too attached to our opinions, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

heart said:

ever considered writing your biography oldbob? I will read it,

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Bob has had a very interesting life. He lived in India for many years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Bob:

You have been complaining about this issue for years. The fact is that there are options for people if they seek them out. There are disability/low income memberships.

Media costs money to produce.

I happen to know for a fact that the financial policies in the DC come directly from ChNN. When you complain about the money, you are complaining about the boss.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

heart said:

Not comparing him to you Malcolm, anyway we never met IRL.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I am not an oral translator. I was a) discouraged from learning colloquial Tibetan by my original Tibetan teacher b) I have spent insufficient time in Tibetan communities to gain oral fluency c) Colloquial Tibetan is of little use in translating Dharma texts.

And no, we never met in meatspace.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The power issues in the gars is ameliorated by the fact that board of directors must rotate every three years. No one can be a member of the board for more than three years.

M

Sönam said:

In theory ... I had the personal experience in a specific relation that, once one has been engaged in a responsibility, one stay involved as a consulting reference and impact Gar relations over his mandate.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, one weakness of the model is that the Gakyil loses its memory every three years. Another problem is that sometimes people only go onto the Gakyil because they do not like the way things were being run. But the latter is not a good motivation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

conebeckham said:

I dunno the Gars from Timbuktu, of course, so my words may not reflect accurately on the situation. Just some general observations.

Malcolm wrote:

Different gars, different energies. Tsegyalgar is a bit heavy sometimes, but maybe that is because it is in New England.

The power issues in the gars is ameliorated by the fact that board of directors must rotate every three years. No one can be a member of the board for more than three years.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Zhang Zhung and Garab Dorje

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

For me personal Rigpa is Awareness like preferred in Bon and Nyingma and not Knowledge like translated in ChNN's DC.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, rig pa is just a word. You either understand what it means or you don't.

M

Sönam said:

Then you don't translate ... you take it as it already is.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Correct -- or in my case, backtranslate it to vidyā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

username said:

...I remember Frances Garrett's ebook affected your views.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all -- her book is an excellent summary of the available gestational models in various cycles, TTM, Kalacakra and Rgra thal gyur, etc.

username said:

On another point, Ayurveda as a source, has really just been taken up in recent decades properly, just like all Tibetan Studies, and needs much more research.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Like the Four Tantra's (in which respect is paid to Bonpos in terms of which tradition to which one should resort when doing rites to dispell provocations), the Aṣṭāṅgahridaya Samhita is a text, which while authored by a follower of Buddhadharma, pays respect to Brahmins and others in terms of the customs a patient might use as their spiritual support.

username said:

Thirdly the aspects of language theory you are referring to affect not only Tibetan studies but all fields as a century of European theorists have been debating. It is a vast area.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed. My work is just a drop in a vast sea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

username said:

All translators, like all writers, have judgments and views which they can not stop coming across. Also every translation, or any writing, affects each reader uniquely.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is true. I just try to translate the text as accurately as I can, taking the meaning into account first. Thus, when I see a term like sang rgyas I just translate it as Buddha, buddhahood, etc. without making too much judgment unless there is a play on words in the text.

Actually for all the recent sturm and drung about this and that "view" of mine, I really try very hard to be as transparent in my translations as possible. Of course, you are right, I have to make choices, but I hope that my choices based on my 23 years as a Dharma practitioner are informed primarily by my practice of these teachings. To be honest, the greatest single thing that changed the way I linguistically looked at Dzogchen texts in particular was studying Tibetan Medicine. Dzogchen language, like the language of medicine is not static, it is dynamic, process-oriented, where as the language of Madhyamaka, Abhidharma, etc., is very static.

One thing people forget is that there is a close connection with Dzogchen and Tibetan doctors. Even Chetsun Senge Wangchuk was a doctor, and many great tertons, like Rigdzin Godem, Rigzin Jatson Nyingpo, Kongtrul, Khyentse, etc., were skilled physicians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

username said:

You have a talent in pithy precise definitions but every translator's hues of judgments comes true. Maybe that is why you keep changing them.

Malcolm wrote:

Not sure which judgements you mean. But every translation is a learning experience and an opportunity for learning and refinement.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Interview with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche about Dzogchen....

Content:

username said:

Thanks to Erik's translations similar to this over the decades who is the best lotsawa IMO and whose mastery technically in vocabulary and context is even more apt than Valby IMO whose dictionary is fantastic too, nevermind lessers.

Malcolm wrote:

Hey, I thought you said I might be the best English translator:

Your work here is benefiting many and I hope it continues in force as well as looking forward to your translations as I think you might be the best living English translator But it is not really a competition since my spoken Tibetan sucks...Erik is a fine translator. So is Valby, and a host of others.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Zhang Zhung and Garab Dorje

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

For me personal Rigpa is Awareness like preferred in Bon and Nyingma and not Knowledge like translated in ChNN's DC.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, rig pa is just a word. You either understand what it means or you don't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Word of the Day

Content:

simhamuka said:

kor-wa -- circumambulate

བསྐྱོད་པ་

Malcolm wrote:

བསྐྱོད་པ་.

You left off the narö.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: New Bon - Bon Sarma

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

P.s.: I hope that this dark blue colour is ok for your eyes.

Malcolm wrote:

You could just choose to use the quote tags. It is much easier for everyone to read.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of ChNNR for Newcomers

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

But charging \$10,000 for a teaching is ludicrous, that isn't right IMO.

Malcolm wrote:

Bob was referring to a voluntary donation made to a Lama in order to sponsor a teaching.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Life history of Maitripa ?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Hi All,

Do you have the story of life history of Maitripa?

I come accross that he is the mahasidda who didnt follow tantric practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Um, not, this is not correct. This is the main form of Vajrayogini he promulgated from his vision of her:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen

Content:

Anders said:

So basically no difference between sensing each other 'face to face' and sensing each other through the online medium, if I understand you correctly?

Malcolm wrote:

For the purposes of communication, nope. If smell or touch is involved, as in some empowerments, there is an issue -- but for transmitting refuge, bodhisattva vows, teachings, etc., there is no problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 13th, 2012 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Any questions? One can't make an omelette without breaking a few eggs, I suppose.

Gassho, Jundo

...stating that face-to-face encounters are "the basis for evaluating a student's readiness for ordination and eventually membership in the SZBA." By "face-to-face," the SZBA board means "in the same physical room.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement betrays a basic lack of understanding of how the material aggregates is defined.

M

Anders said:

As a point of curiosity - how are we to understand how the material aggregates are defined, for the purpose of evaluating a student's readiness, sub-context of online interaction and all that?

Malcolm wrote:

The material aggregates include all five physical sense organs and sense objects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 12:58 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Should be:

So we professionals don't really get a pass the same way privileged gurus do when they do not serve the best interests of their patients.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

xylem said:

if anything, vajrayana is about personal responsibility.

Malcolm wrote:

So is life.

xylem said:

what makes this difficult for western converts is that we give all of our responsibility away.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this sentiment at all.

xylem said:

we project all sorts of qualities and expectations from our own side that are completely unrelated to the lama's qualities and capabilities.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a two way street -- there is a cultural lack of comprehension on both sides.

xylem said:

we have some unnatural notion that the spiritual work is done from the side of the lama and not our own side.

Malcolm wrote:

No one I know has this idea.

xylem said:

...we come away from teachings high on some sort of contact lama buzz and reach for that again and again.

Malcolm wrote:

When there is such dependencies, it is not as if westerners are not being encouraged to become empowerment junkies.

xylem said:

if we thought about it rationally we'd know this is madness, but there is so much psychological need. it's really hard to look beneath that veneer to even begin to examine the lama in a traditional way, and having built up all of this psychological projection around the lama, it's really difficult, even painful, to address a problem and walk away. given all this, i think it's even more imperative to put the burden on responsibility of examining the lama entirely on the student. why? because there's a little bit of personal introspection and self-work we need to do to get to that point.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is all great, but in Vajrayāna students are disempowered in all kinds of direct and indirect fashions which makes examining teachers for proper qualities damn near impossible. Students are put in the catch-22 of committing to lamas they do not know or missing out entirely because they do not trust the situation. For the most part, the cultural hierarchies that Tibetan Buddhism is embedded within make it virtually impossible for students, especially beginning students to have a clear picture of their teachers. These memes and hierarchies are also exploited by western teachers. And this is not merely a problem in Vajrayāna, this is also a problem in Zen. (In Theravada it is a little more clear since lay teachers are comparatively rare and monastic precepts are highly valued.) The of course there is the taboo against criticizing any lama from whom one has received transmission no matter how egregious their behavior has been. This taboo is actually more enforced by students than lamas. So there is enormous peer pressure within dysfunctional groups to regard the pathological behavior of Dipshit Rinpoche, etc., as "awakened activity".

So frankly, while I can appreciate the caveat emptor approach, we are too quick to divorce gurus from their own personal responsibility to their students when we insist it is all on the student.

xylem said:

one has to come to some sense of personal responsibility for one's health and healing and have oriented their minds somewhat towards changing one's life.

Malcolm wrote:

As a physician of Tibetan Medicine myself I can appreciate your sentiment, but ultimately, if I am not correctly treating the patient, that does not lie at the feet of the patient, that is my fault. So we professionals don't really get a pass the same way privileged gurus do when they do serve the best interests of their patients.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 12th, 2012 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Baloney! and Jundo Cohen

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Any questions? One can't make an omelette without breaking a few eggs, I suppose.

Gassho, Jundo

...stating that face-to-face encounters are "the basis for evaluating a student's readiness for ordination and eventually membership in the SZBA." By "face-to-face," the SZBA board means "in the same physical room.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement betrays a basic lack of understanding of how the material aggregates is defined.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Four forbidden fruits

Content:

Huseng said:

比邏婆

(H2) bilvá [p= 732,1] [L=145299] m. (in later language also vilva) Aegle Marmelos , the wood-apple tree (commonly called Bel ; its delicious fruit when unripe is used medicinally ; its leaves , are employed in the ceremonial of the worship of śiva ; cf. RTL. 336) AV. &c

While the transliteration seems to be pointing to this, I'd have to see if anywhere else

this kind of fruit is banned.

Malcolm wrote:

Unlikely, since in Chinese depictions of Bhaisajyaguru, this is the fruit he is depicted as holding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really. And spirit possession is painful and taxing, from what I understand.

Huseng said:

Okay, that clarifies what I was curious about.

In the context of this thread I thought it might shed some light on the possible mechanism by which a plant could be "inhabited" by a deva or spirit as the Jataka literature suggests.

Malcolm wrote:

As I opined before, there is little difference between presuming that our body is inhabited by an atman (popular Indian view) and the idea that a plant is inhabited by a deva. Certainly, there is plenty of evidence based on Jatakas and non-Buddhist sources that these tree devas regard their trees as their bodies.

Thus, I think it is basically a way of archaic method of talking about plant minds/bodies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

So I'm really wondering if I am interpreting ChNNR correctly in assuming that previous practice commitments are met through Guruyoga as he teaches it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Blue Garuda said:

Thanks.

I'm assuming Guruyoga is a daily practice for Dzogchen as taught by ChNNR. It's being

very productive for me and so is a personal commitment. ChNNR doesn't seem to have given it as a formal practice commitment, but I'm assuming I should regard it as such anyway, with the White A for each morning, evening etc. ?

Malcolm wrote:

You should practice Ati Guru Yoga all the time, there are no specific sessions. Anytime you stop and take a break at work, while you are walking, driving, eating, making love, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Spirits do not have gross physical bodies, they lack visible form, according to Tibetan Medicine. In the case of an oracle like Nechung, the monk (and must be a monk) for example, will experience what we would call epilepsy. Then the monk in question will undergo years of training to make their channel system receptive to the various deities associated with Nechung. So effectively what happens is that entity seizes the prāṇa system of the body.

In terms of diseases caused by provocations, these manifest as different diseases depending on the type of provocation.

Huseng said:

So strictly speaking there is no idea that spirits can "inhabit" a body otherwise normally under the control of the original of another sattva?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not really. And spirit possession is painful and taxing, from what I understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can for example, rationalize that there are devas that inhabit plants as houses (standard Indo-Tibetan view), but as far as I am concerned this is merely a way of articulating the sentience of plants. It may be the case that plants achieve sentience only in communities, just like our body is not wholly sentient -- to use your example of a branch which can be propagated, also cells from our body may be propagated etc., and we certainly would not necessarily call either sentient in a conventional way.

Huseng said:

In Tibetan medicine how does spirit possession work in this context? Do they externally

provoke symptoms or do they "hijack and infiltrate" a being (like a deva inhabiting a plant as a house)?

Malcolm wrote:

Spirits do not have gross physical bodies, they lack visible form, according to Tibetan Medicine. In the case of an oracle like Nechung, the monk (and must be a monk) for example, will experience what we would call epilepsy. Then the monk in question will undergo years of training to make their channel system receptive to the various deities associated with Nechung. So effectively what happens is that entity seizes the prāṇa system of the body.

In terms of diseases caused by provocations, these manifest as different diseases depending on the type of provocation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

So I'm really wondering if I am interpreting ChNNR correctly in assuming that previous practice commitments are met through Guruyoga as he teaches it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

Ogyen said:

My reply was no joke... I was thinking, perhaps if my work were seen for what it is, I should blush, come to my senses and put some content warning on it.....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Ogyen said:

For example, we could benefit from a female Malcolm-type posting here -

Malcolm wrote:

Step up, the post is vacant.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

xylem said:

but it might be hard. regardless, the burden is on us, not the lama.

Malcolm wrote:

You would never say that about a doctor or any other kind of professional. So why give gurus a pass?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 11th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is the best way for a Dzogchen practitioner, in my opinion: my teacher and I have the same state. His/her job is to show me that state and s/he can do that because they are a further along the path than I.

(Of course I think that ChNN is an awakened person, but that is a different story).

Adamantine said:

So do you think someone who has not somewhat realized/accomplished Dzogchen view-meditation-and-action is capable of giving pointing out? How far along the path do they need to be? I believe most people see their teachers this way :further along the path-- maybe much further.. not too many are thinking in a categorical way(with exception of DM people maybe) such as "my teacher is an 8th Bhumi Bodhisattva" or a "fully realized Buddha", etc. Although probably many students of HH Dudjom Rinpoche did feel this way, with good reason, just as you feel that way about ChNN... some great masters there is just too much evidence to dispute that they are awakened, then it becomes "reasonable" faith, not blind faith..

Malcolm wrote:

They have to have the experience of at least the second vision, in addition to other necessary qualifications.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Definition of Mahamudra according to CNR

Content:

Adamantine said:

But correspond means what exactly? I am assuming there are not practices that work with visual phenomenon and light in the same way Thogal practices do...

Malcolm wrote:

It is a literal definition i.e. la bzla ba (which is a Dzogchen term incidentally, it is a very old Tibetan word) means "to transcend, to go beyond", thod rgal means literally, in a sutra sense "skipping bhumis", which how it is used in sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Yes. Two things. One, the teacher was/is totally delusional. IMO not really someone who "understands the material, has done necessary retreats, and has permission to teach". And two, I'm not really sure that viewing one's teacher as a Buddha requires you to drop all reason.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but Pero -- if you decide that someone is a Buddha, then you will see their delusions as skillful means.

And two, when decide, based on a conceptual belief that someone is a Buddha, then well, it is hard to be reasonable or reasoned with about that person.

This is the best way for a Dzogchen practitioner, in my opinion: my teacher and I have the same state. His/her job is to show me that state and s/he can do that because they are a further along the path than I.

There, see? No belief that one's teacher is a Buddha required.

M

(Of course I think that ChNN is an awakened person, but that is a different story).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

uan said:

So then we lose the opportunity forever? There are an infinite number of opportunities, some we see, most we don't. That well doesn't run dry.

Malcolm wrote:

That's being optimistic.

uan said:

I agree with the first part of your premise, which is ChNN presents us with a unique opportunity, but if one doesn't take it, it'd only be a big deal in a conventional sense, and probably not even then, and certainly not in a "time is running out" sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Time is running out. It always is. People live 80-90 years at most, in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Pero:

I think it is a total joke for unrealized teachers to permit their students to perceive them as Buddhas. This is encouraging people to believe in fantasies.

You can think it wrong all you like. That is what I think. So we will agree to disagree.

Pero said:

Ok, though it's not like I don't get where you're coming from. But I still wonder what you think of the saying that "if you view the teacher as a realized being..." then?

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize this is exactly the kind of thinking that lead the Diamond Mountain people down their particular garden path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Pero:

I think it is a total joke for unrealized teachers to permit their students to perceive them as Buddhas. This is encouraging people to believe in fantasies.

You can think it wrong all you like. That is what I think. So we will agree to disagree.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but we don't have a lot of time, and time is passing.

uan said:

really? very linear concept. I guess we only have this one life then the flame goes out forever.

Malcolm wrote:

Flame? No? Opportunity, very likely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I see the first four more as an encouragement not to waste time or energy on useless things. But I don't see them as an encouraging a path of renunciation.

Clarence said:

What is not useless besides practicing?

Malcolm wrote:

Enjoying your life, having a nice glass of wine, a juicy steak, a good woman (or man) at your side, nice music, flowers, herbs, etc.

All these things are important and necessary (depending on your preferences and health, etc.)

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

xylem said:

"encouragement not to waste time or energy on useless things" is the pith essence of renunciation even in the sutra tradition.

i'm starting to think people just want to fight here.

there is really only one dharma.

-xy

Malcolm wrote:

I see the first four (lojongs of vima nyigthig) more as an encouragement not to waste time or energy on useless things. But I don't see them as a encouraging a path of renunciation.

Not really xylem-- the motive is really quite different. In Sutrayāna teachings, desire for example is regarded as poison, etc. Dzogchen is not a path of renunciation, as you know. Suggesting that in order to understand Dzogchen you must engage in path of renunciation practices is, my opinion, just not so.

As to your other observation, yes it is true, people really mostly want to have arguments here. Hence my decreasing participation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

This was said by Padmasambhava and Norbu Rinpoche mentions it often, it's an important practice. So you guys should be careful in what you say...

Malcolm wrote:

The onus is on the teacher's side to be honest. Conceptually deciding that Dipshit Rinpoche and Geshe Unctuous is a Buddha when all his actions indicate the contrary is just plain stupid and deluded. When Dipshit Rinpoche and Geshe Unctuous encourage their students into such beliefs, it just creates cults.

M

Pero said:

Sure, but that's not what you said at first.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is. I was saying that teachers who recognize that they are not realized should

completely discourage their students from perceiving them as Buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 10th, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

However, I do believe there are quite a few more than the one you are promoting. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but we don't have a lot of time, and time is passing.

Adamantine said:

But if they didn't have the connection with ChNN, then time would be passing until they found their karmic Guru, even if they stayed with ChNN out of fear that time was passing... or isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Such a person would be like a man who did not like the shape the gold nugget he has found, and discards it to look for another, more attractive one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

we have to embrace renunciation

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Dzogchen.

heart said:

eh? how about the lodjongs in the Vima Nyinthig? that is real meaning of renunciation.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I see the first four more as an encouragement not to waste time or energy on useless things. But I don't see them as an encouraging a path of renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:
we have to embrace renunciation

Malcolm wrote:
Not in Dzogchen.

kirtu said:
You are correct that in dzogchen we do not have to embrace renunciation and in fact as a conceptualization it will get in the way of realization but consider the actual lives of people drowning in the poisons. If they were able to see the arising of lust or anger as the adornment of wisdom and really rest in that then there would be no problem. But most people can't do that. They get carried away at some point. So for them dzogchen on the cushion and dzogchen view as much as possible but they will need some renunciation as a safety net. Otherwise some people are on a highwire and will endure some painful encounters with the ground.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:
people need to understand their own condition, but they do not need canned religion.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 10:07 PM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
kirtu said:
we have to embrace renunciation

Malcolm wrote:
Not in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 9:04 PM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:
Pero said:
This was said by Padmasambhava and Norbu Rinpoche mentions it often, it's an important practice. So you guys should be careful in what you say...

Malcolm wrote:
The onus is on the teacher's side to be honest. Conceptually deciding that Dipshit Rinpoche and Geshe Unctuous is a Buddha when all his actions indicate the contrary is just plain stupid and deluded. When Dipshit Rinpoche and Geshe Unctuous encourage their students into such beliefs, it just creates cults.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: How can Buddhists be so sure of themselves?

Content:

Ikkyu said:

What real, hard evidence is there that bodhisattvas exist, that enlightenment is possibility or that rebirth can happen either?

Malcolm wrote:

None. Zip. Zero. Nada.

This is why Buddhism is a religion.

But wisdom is not scientific.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but such a person should be honest with themselves and their students and even if they give empowerments, should never insist, encourage, or even subtly imply that their students should regard them as "buddhas".

Clarence said:

How much use would empowerments from such a person be? Wouldn't it be cause for rebirth in the lower realms for both teacher and student?

Malcolm wrote:

If the teacher in question understands the material, has done necessary retreats, and has permission to teach, then there is no problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 7:52 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Sherlock said:

Can a non-awakened teacher, nevertheless with good intentions and an understanding of the teachings, still give teachings which will benefit the students?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but such a person should be honest with themselves and their students and even if they give empowerments, should never insist, encourage, or even subtly imply that their students should regard them as "buddhas".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The open ones you can.

Totoro said:

I'm sorry do you mean I can view the next open webcast or some previous webcasts? Because I don't see anything I can view from previous webcasts there at the moment.

If I am a complete newbie, do you think it's advisable for me to take part in the upcoming open webcasts or wait until I take part in the WWT for the first time? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Take first webcast you can, i.e:

Hawaii Retreat

June 13 -17, 2012

Longsal Ati'i Nadzer

Hawaii Time (HST) is GMT-10

OPEN WEBCAST

13th June 4pm-6pm

Introduction about Ati Dzogchen Teaching and its transmission.
Tridlung of Short Gana Puja.

14th June 10am-12pm

Instruction on the important Viewpoint of Ati Dzogchen.
Instruction on the important Point of Gompa for Ati Dzogchen, and
tridlung of Short Thun.

12:30-1:00 pm. Short Gana Puja for the Day of the Dakini.

15th June 10am-12pm.

Instruction on the important Point of Jyodpa for Ati Dzogchen, and tridlung of Mediu Gana Puja.

16th June 10am-12pm.

Instruction on the important Point of Drasbu for Ati Dzogchen, and tridlung of Medium Thun.

4-7pm. Medium Gana Puja for end of retreat.

17th June 10am-12pm.

Advice for daily life practices, and tridlungs of collective practices, etc.
Ati Guru Yoga for finish of retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 10:09 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

However, I do believe there are quite a few more than the one you are promoting. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but we don't have a lot of time, and time is passing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It was an observation made about people's trip about having awakened teachers, who then fail to follow through on that aspiration and follow other teachers for various reasons.

Adamantine said:

But you aren't intending to imply that these people's other teachers are not awakened? Because if you do not mean that, then the whole statement starts to lose sense. . .

Malcolm wrote:

There are almost no awakened teachers. I am not commenting on any specific teacher, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: No need for relative bodhicitta

Content:

Adamantine said:

I recently asked Garchen Rinpoche a question about this...

Malcolm wrote:

I am glad you had this teaching from Garchen Rinpoche, I hope you apply it well.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Totoro,

have you read "The Crystal and the Way of Light? If not I would suggest starting there.

Then if you are still interested watch a few webcasts. Here is the link:

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

The long term schedule for the webcasts can be found here:

<http://www.melong.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Specific times for each one will be posted a few days ahead of time on the webcast site.

If you do that and you feel it is for you then you can become a Dzogchen Community member. Then from there, well, the skies the limit. (pun intended hehehe)

Totoro said:

Thanks FD, I don't think i can watch those webcasts if I'm not a member with a p/w yet.

Malcolm wrote:

The open ones you can.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: No need for relative bodhicitta

Content:

jnanasutra said:

isn't it amazing that in Dzogchen there is no need to cultivate relative bodhicitta because dynamic compassionate activity is already present in the basis. We do not say that the buddha's activity is like a wish-fulfilling gem which manifests due to disciples prayers and aspirations, but rather compassion manifest of it own accord as a natural expression of the basis. How nice!

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, we say it is exactly like a wishfulfilling gem that spontaneously manifests whatever is wished for -- that is the energy of the basis.

jnanasutra said:

Right, it is the energy of the basis, not dependent on the wishes and aspirations of disciples. It is an inherent natural expression, not dependent upon others.

Malcolm wrote:

What I am saying is that Dzogchen tantras and text explicitly use the metaphor of the wishfulfilling gem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 8:22 AM

Title: Re: No need for relative bodhicitta

Content:

jnanasutra said:

isn't it amazing that in Dzogchen there is no need to cultivate relative bodhicitta because dynamic compassionate activity is already present in the basis. We do not say that the buddha's activity is like a wish-fulfilling gem which manifests due to disciples prayers and aspirations, but rather compassion manifest of it own accord as a natural expression of the basis. How nice!

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, we say it is exactly like a wishfulfilling gem that spontaneously manifests whatever is wished for -- that is the energy of the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

xylem said:

malcolm...

if not a criticism of those individuals' teachers-- then who/what... or are you being completely misconstrued as criticizing anyone/anything?

-xy

Adamantine said:

Now, ChNN is one of my own teachers.. but I have other teachers who I am closer to who I consider to be at least equally realized, as do many people here.. but Malcolm's above post clearly makes it sound like if someone is studying with someone other than ChNN, then they "like limitations, it makes them feel comfortable" This clearly contradicts a great amount of what he said in the other post. dismissing other people's teachers, Dzogchen teachers or otherwise in this way, is to me certainly a type of tribalism.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a criticism of anyone's _teachers_.

It was an observation made about people's trip about having awakened teachers, who then fail to follow through on that aspiration and follow other teachers for various reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Now, ChNN is one of my own teachers.. but I have other teachers who I am closer to who I consider to be at least equally realized, as do many people here.. but Malcolm's above post clearly makes it sound like if someone is studying with someone other than ChNN, then they "like limitations, it makes them feel comfortable" This clearly contradicts a great amount of what he said in the other post. dismissing other people's teachers, Dzogchen teachers or otherwise in this way, is to me certainly a type of tribalism.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a criticism of anyone's _teachers_.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 9th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Nakedness

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Is that a quote from trungpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, it is a quote from Malcolm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Nakedness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The easiest thing in the world to do is walk naked, and the hardest. We have to take off the clothes we put on in which to admire ourselves. If we don't, then we never see the truth of ourselves. We are naked to others even if we think we are clothed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Buddh-ism without the -ism?

Content:

Jinzang said:

Buddhahood is explained as the completion of the two accumulations, the accumulation of merit and wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

In some systems.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

But since Malcolm stopped posting the rest of group A have some problem getting their arguments together and so discussion is dwindling.

/magnus

Sönam said:

This is provocative and wrong ... arguments of all sorts have been provided, and Malcom has not been the only one to post on the subject. Anyone can consult them in previous threads. It is just that there is no positive reasons in looping again and again in the same circle.

Also, having been understood, I have been asked not to come again and again on the same subject ... so I consider it right and I stop posting.

But now that some of us have decided not to continue this looping discussion, what you call group B is coming strongly and say "you see they don't post anymore ... it's because they have nothing to say, ah, ah, ah"

Be happy.
Sönam

heart said:

I am always wrong Sönam, but it wasn't meant as a provocation. I only noticed that very little happened since Malcolm stopped posting (probably my fault) in these threads. My sincere apologize for the provocative way I formulated that sentence my only excuse is that I really don't believe there is any homogenous group A or B.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I have not added anything new to these threads because I haven't anything new to say.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Buddh-ism without the -ism?

Content:

alpha said:

Trying to acumulate merit after you've discovered your nature would be delusion.

Jinzang said:

The traditional view is that bodhisattvas on the first bhumi and above continue to accumulate merit through one kalpa while they strive to attain enlightenment. I suppose from one standpoint you are correct: merit, enlightenment, and budhahood are all delusions. But that leaves us with nothing to talk about.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the view enunciated by Haribhadra.

Jinzang said:

It seems that some people on this forum are trying to gift wrap Neo-Advaita and sell it as the highest vehicle of Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not observed this to be the case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not for me. Mahayoga and Anuyoga are not my path. They can be someone else's path, but they are not mine.

heart said:

In that case your opinions on this subject are, with all respect, irrelevant.

/magnus

Malcolm, perhaps I wrote that when I was a bit pissed with you. I do actually put a lot of value in your opinions, whatever you want to call yourself, because I admire your bright intellect. I also consider that my path is Dzogchen but do apply whatever I want to and have transmission for among the methods of the nine yanas. You might feel the same, or not, sorry if I sounded harsh. Certainly your opinions are not irrelevant.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

No worries.

My path is Dzogchen. When I do yoga practice, it is Dzogchen. When I garden it is Dzogchen. When I relax, it is Dzogchen. Unless of course I am distracted, then it is mind, even if I am sounding A or doing Rushan, or reciting a mantra, or whatever.

But my path is Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Listen, I'm basing my view on Buddhism, and you clearly aren't.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as this question goes, I think the scholastic buddhist perspective is outdated and wrong.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 7:20 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

In what way do you think plants have perception, as described canonically in my post? Blue, yellow, hot, cold, smooth, sharp, rough, etc. Do you think that the perceptions take place being expressed through this theoretical plant-brain network? How does a plant designate, or label what is yellow or green, what is smooth or hard, how does it mark an experience and retain recognition of that experience? I'm not saying I "know" they don't perceive, but, there's no evidence for perception, need for it, and the scientific observations actually oppose perception. What's more, the canonical resources never insinuate a need for perceptual, karmic, plant sentience.

Malcolm wrote:

Mt. Meru is "canonical".

Your science is outdated.

The qualia of plants, like that of bats, is closed to us.

Son said:

Against Perception:

Trees experience strong wind or weak wind, but what in the tree designates, "this is strong and this is weak?" It does not make a mark, "these are the designations of wind that I have experienced." It responds to the wind chemically over and over. The rosemary bush, when having a leaf plucked, does not designate that sense in any way, "the leaf was plucked," and mark it for later recognition, so that when another leaf is cut, it refers to that same mark of designation. One leaf is cut, then another leaf is cut, and another and another and so forth, but the plant just reacts according to the experience and doesn't empirically memorize the suggestion of losing leaves. It doesn't need to, because the leaves are lost in Fall, and leaves regrow in Spring. It just happens, inherently. Therefore there is no volition, which means there is no pretense of volition, no karma, and therefore cannot be previous life nor rebirth, and no stream of karmic consciousness, reproductive consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

So you assert and cannot prove.

Son said:

Against Mental Formation:

Lacking mental formation, in which consciousness has its discrete origin, plants do not have consciousness of their own stratum.

Malcolm wrote:

So you assert but cannot prove.

Son said:

Against Obscuring Consciousness and Storehouse Consciousness:

These living beings are thus "primitive sentient," or, "proto-sentient, sub-sentient." There is substratum consciousness, but it lacks the obscuring consciousness and there is no karmic tainting that displays storehouse consciousnesses. In other words, they have empty storehouse consciousness, and the only reason they're able to be sentient living beings at all, is because the primordial substratum consciousness provides contact between "sense base" and "sense object." So they lack perceiving and mental formation, and there's no presence of continual consciousness, only "projected."

Malcolm wrote:

Now you are contradicting yourself and yogacara theory. The ālavijñāna exists only so as long as the bijas exist. When they are eradicated, the ālavijñāna vanishes.

Son said:

The Buddha did say that consciousness arises in mental formation (thus storehouse consciousness, derived from prim.sub.conscious.),

Malcolm wrote:

Your complicated yogacara arguments are quite irrelevant to the question, AFAIC. You are in essence saying plants are projections. Ok. Yogacara is unconvincing. I don't buy it.

Son said:

but it's perfectly sensible to regard substratum consciousness as functioning without mental formation, without storehouse consciousness. In fact, that's how the Dharmakaya and Sambhogakayas (hence nirmanakayas) function in the Mahayanist views. So you can't exist karmically as a plant, and neither them as other beings--which is why they're not described in the cosmological system. But by all means, the Buddhas can. To me, this also provides some illumination to the nature of wildlife devas...

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you accept that plants are awakened.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Yes, well plants have intelligence. That's not new news--in fact, it is very, very old. And to the concentrated scientific observer, plant intelligence is obvious. Why do you think we call plants "living beings?"

However, they don't have "sanna," or perceptions.

Malcolm wrote:
So you claim.

Son said:
... Are you going to refute that claim, or present arguments against it? Discussion?

In order for a plant to have consciousness "of its own, storehouse consciousness," volitions or mental formation must give rise to that. They don't intend and obsess over objects, they don't "form volition" in the mind, there is no coloring of the mind derived from sensations. They do not apprehend the quality of sense-objects, and color their own mind in that way. They simply react to it naturally, there is no coloring or intention and obsessions over the objects, it's an impersonal experience. So, personal sentient consciousness can't arise here, dependent on mental formations.

Malcolm wrote:
You have not presented any arguments at all, all you have presented is the same bald unsupported assertions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 5:42 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

Karma Dorje said:
So what you are saying is that you can't find a convenient category to put a viewpoint (or more properly group of congruent viewpoints) in, so it vexes you? Isn't this exactly the point of your so-called camp "A"?

xylem said:
nothing vexes me. i can't get my mind around what's being discussed so i'm trying to clarify. from what i can call i'm 50% camp "A", 50% camp "B" which doesn't promise to have a good outcome.

-xy

Malcolm wrote:
That's because this thread was split off from another thread and given this title by a mod. Refer to my op for context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Any chance of you scanning and attaching the abovementioned page?

Malcolm wrote:

As befits their modular structure and the ability to grow from each of their modules, unlike animals, plants have no use for a centralized brain and/or nervous system. Instead of centralized brain tissue, a newly emerging field of plant science, dubbed “plant neurobiology,” is suggesting that plants may actually have thousands of brain-like entities that are involved in the emergence of intelligent behavior. These entities are a type of tissue known as meristems. Current theories suggest that the meristematic tissue, located at the tips of roots and shoots, combined with the vascular strands capable of complex molecular and electrical signalling, may well comprise the plant equivalent of the nervous/neuronal system.⁵⁴ In a groundbreaking text *Communication in Plants*, Baluška et al. echo the pioneering work of Darwin:

Each root apex is proposed to harbour brain-like units of the nervous system of plants. The number of root apices in the plant body is high, and all “brain units” are interconnected via vascular strands (plant neurons) with their polarly-transported auxin (plant neurotransmitter), to form a serial (parallel) neuronal system of plants.⁵⁵

Rather than following Darwin’s judgement that this plant nervous system is inferior to that found in animals, plant neurobiology researchers regard this decentralized assessment and response system to be the most effective for maximizing plant fitness.⁵⁶ Such a system is thought to enable decentralized behavior (i.e., growth), which allows plants to thrive in complex and everchanging rhizospheric environments.

It has been proposed that in the plant the meristematic “brains” may exert influence on the rest of the plant tissue by the transmission of signalling molecules such as the hormone auxin. Auxins are manufactured at the root and shoot apices, and it is thought that their movement is one method for allowing the transfer of information throughout the individual. It has been proposed that the end poles (cross walls of cells) are analogous to the synapse in animals.⁵⁷ At so called “plant synapses,” vesicular transport of auxin moves this signalling molecule from cell to cell. Although the exact processes have yet to be uncovered, it has been proposed that this extracellular transport of auxin “exerts rapid electrical responses” across the plant synapse and “initiates the electrical responses of plant cells.”⁵⁸ Whatever the pathway within the plant, communication can occur over long-distances, with information on the environmental and developmental state of the roots being transferred to the shoots—as in the case of stomatal closure during water stress. As well as auxin and electrical signals, plants produce and use a variety of neurotransmitter molecules to communicate from cell to cell. Dopamine, acetylcholine, glutamate, histamine, and glycine are all touted as potential signalling chemicals between cells.⁵⁹ Other complex communication

molecules include protein kinases, minerals, lipids, sugars, gases, and nucleic acids. Trewavas has drawn attention to this complexity and notes that “from the current rate of progress, it looks as though communication is likely to be as complex as that within a [animal] brain.”⁶⁰

In response to some of the assertions of plant neurobiologists, Alpi et al. have suggested that the existence of plasmodesmata (microscopic channels, which traverse plant cell walls and enable transport and communication between cells) contradicts the idea of plant synapses and of auxin as a neurotransmitter, as their existence facilitates extensive electrical coupling, precluding the need for any cell-cell transmission of a neurotransmitter-like compound.⁶¹ However, this criticism has been refuted by Brenner et al., who assert that although the exact pathways are still to be discovered, auxin is known to be transported from cell-cell and active, communicative plant behavior does take place.⁶² Along with the exact mechanisms of electrical cell-cell coupling, they assert that investigating these transfers represents an exciting field of study for understanding plant signalling and behavior.

With thousands of meristems, a plant has potentially thousands of “brain units.” It is proposed by advocates of plant neurobiology that plants integrate sensory information and make decisions based upon communication between a multitude of plant tissues such as the root meristems, interior meristems, and the vascular tissues. Barlow has pointed toward the involvement of the vascular tissue (xylem and phloem) in conveying APs from zones of special sensitivity to other regions of the plant—an “informational channel” involved in organismal organization.⁶³ Trewavas has proposed that the meristematic tissue, which runs throughout the plant, could be an integrative assessment and computational tissue, acting with sensory input from local meristems.⁶⁴ With active debate on this topic, it is still to be uncovered whether this internal communication systems are centralized, decentralized, or somewhere in between.⁶⁵

The structural complexity of these communication networks within plants is of great interest for an understanding of the intelligent behavior that plants display. The eminent animal physiologist Denis Noble has recently argued that networkstyle interactions (like those found in plants), actually organize and direct the activity of all living beings. In *The Music of Life*, he disputes the view that a unitary, external mind or self controls and directs the activity of living organisms.⁶⁶ Against this Cartesian notion, Noble argues that it is decentralized communicative networks that heterarchically self-organize and direct living activity.

In Noble’s view of systems biology, “there is no single controller.” no single Cartesian mind substance, which is the director of living systems.⁶⁷ Instead, from a systems viewpoint, mental properties such as intelligence, reasoning, and choice are thought to emerge from the interactions of physiological networks of signalling and communication. As Evan Thompson puts it, the “emergent process is one that results from collective self-organisation.”⁶⁸ These principles of heterarchical organization and the emergence of higher level properties are fundamental

principles of systems biology, which are elegantly summed up by

Fritjof Capra: According to the systems view, the essential properties of an organism, or living system, are properties of the whole, which none of the parts

have. They arise from the interactions and relationships between the parts. These properties are destroyed when the system is dissected, either physically or theoretically, into isolated elements.⁶⁹

Although the exact pathways are still being investigated, we can state that from a systems perspective, the interconnecting, heterarchical network of plant tissues (including meristems) enables intelligent plant behavior, rather than the Cartesian consciousness or free will alluded to by Struik et al.⁷⁰

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 8th, 2012 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

However, they don't have "sanna," or perceptions.

Malcolm wrote:

So you claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you just tell me where Mt. Meru is on this planet.

gregkavarnos said:

Just south of Kyrgistan (Utarakuru, Northern Kuru).

PS "Stewart", "practitioner" and "Greg", it really doesn't matter what they do in Shambhala, does it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to Ptolemy, the northern nomads on the central Asian steps were called Kuru -- and I can see, how Kyrgistan could have derived ultimately from Kuru.

However, I don't think the Pamirs = Meru is going to make anyone happy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 12:34 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

I disagree with that view and disagree that what I'm saying indicates Aristotelian view. Maybe if you explained HOW I have Aristotelian view, we could actually decide which is which. But I doubt you will.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, read Aristotle, then compare what you have enunciated with Aristotle's POV about plants being insentient automata.

M

Son said:

Plants aren't in-sentient automata.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you admit plants are sentient and not automata?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 12:16 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

I disagree with that view and disagree that what I'm saying indicates Aristotelian view. Maybe if you explained HOW I have Aristotelian view, we could actually decide which is which. But I doubt you will.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, read Aristotle, then compare what you have enunciated with Aristotle's POV about plants being insentient automata.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 10:10 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Uttarakuru, as Mipham surely conceived it, is not this planet.

kirtu said:

So in your view, Mipham is telling Khenpo Kunpel that they will reunite in a celestial or pure realm? Or perhaps an impure realm just not on the planet? I thought that traditionally all four continents were on this planet surrounding Mt. Meru?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you just tell me where Mt. Meru is on this planet.

The fact is, Uttarakuru is not something accessible for us, according Kosha cosmology, unless you are a siddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 10:06 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

The use of me saying that plants aren't "fully" sentient is because I think it is very wrong, and very bad for people to walk around looking at plant life and--beyond understanding that it is LIVING--think and act as though that plantlife feels, perceives, cognizes, or forms volition in any way

Malcolm wrote:

Right, we don't agree on this point. This is a classic Aristotelian view of plantlife, embedded into our cultural thinking about plants.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 7th, 2012 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Typo alert:

But Buddhism no more moves away from a decentralized notion of sentience that does Aristotle.

Should be "But Buddhism no more moves away from a centralized notion of sentience that does Aristotle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Pls introduce me to Dzogchen

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

(I know you've said having access to a teacher/community has been an issue for you due to your location).

Wesley1982 said:

Distance and location issue is not much of a problem if your teacher/guru can communicate to you through the manifestation of dharma practice.

Malcolm wrote:

There are several upcoming webcast with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

If you look back over the past 7 pages you will find that I have been involved in a discussion on the sentience of plants and not an ideological war on the righteousness of Buddhism and the Buddhist view. This only occurred after you threw out the "heresy watch" accusation. So can we put it to rest now and get on with the point at hand please? ie "Are plants sentient?"

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing intrinsically non-Buddhist about the idea of plant sentience. However the scholastic tradition made it clear that it was uncomfortable with the idea precisely for the same reason you are: what about the karma of eating and killing plants? Thus, the resulting judgment that plants are insentient is truly just a utilitarian claim meant to ease the consciousness of Buddhist scholastics. Because it is certain that common people in India continued to regard plants as sentient, and do so up to the present.

Since you have a background in biology, Matthew Hall suggests that the problem in addressing plant sentience is a function of entrenched zoocentrism in cognitive modeling which begins with Aristotle. When the question gets brought up, the immediate response is "where is the nervous system, where is the brain, etc." It does not occur to people to ask "If plants are sentient, how might plant neurobiology differ from zoomorphic neurobiology?" In particular, in Hall's book on page 147 he discusses the issues of plant brains.

The conceptual problem, as I see it, is that in Buddhism we have substituted "consciousness" for a soul, or a living being (jiva). But Buddhism no more moves away from a decentralized notion of sentience that does Aristotle. Truthfully, there really is not much difference between the idea of a transmigrating consciousness as the irreducible fact of a sentient being and a soul (despite the chorus of protests this will raise). A transmigrating consciousness transmigrates precisely because of the delusion of selfhood. We take rebirth because we are deluded about I-ness. The only difference

between the early Buddhist anatman and the Hindu atman is what is taken as identity. The Hindus understand all persons and phenomena as lacking identity, but suppose that underneath all these illusory appearances, there is a permanent sat-cit-ananda, whose definition is very much like the Mahāyāna definition of tathagatagarbha i.e. permanent, self, blissful, and pure.

The issue, as I see it, is that the substance dualism implicit in the way scholastic Buddhists treat namarūpa make a systems theory of consciousness impossible. This is not an issue in Dzogchen (and to a lesser extent, in Vajrayāna), because consciousness itself is a product of systems interactions i.e. the interactions of the five elements in the body and so on.

What I propose is that the language of plant devas in Buddhist literature is used as a device to ameliorate karmic responsibility for using plants as food. Certainly, in animist traditions where plant spirits are considered, it is not like that. We consult with the spirit of the plant before using it, just as we consult with the spirits of animals we hunt. When we kill a plant, we do not necessarily kill its spirit, just as when we hunt we do not necessarily kill the spirit of the animal we are hunting. This model is still grounded in a naive substance dualism, but it has the benefit of making us recognize that all our actions of eating involve taking life and the life of one living being is not held to be more important than that of another.

Of course in the East Asian Traditions of Buddhism, plant sentience is also accepted in some quarters. The Shingon views of Kukai are very close to my understanding predicated on Dzogchen teachings:

If plants and trees are devoid of Buddhahood,
Waves would then be without humidity.

As people may or may not know, I am committed to the principles of deep ecology/biocentrism, and the denial of plant sentience not in keeping with those principles. If we deny plant sentience, as we do merely on the basis of zoomorphic orthodoxy, we deny the intrinsic value of the great preponderance of biomass on our world and reduce it, in biblical terms, as something merely for our use, biological automata, without sense, without feeling, without intelligence. For many centuries, we regarded animals as mere automata too. Now we understand better. In time, I am certain, we will understand this kind of thinking is a mistake when we consider anything that lives.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

...BUT Sakyong Jamgon Mipham Rinpoche, Jampal Trinley Dradul (born Osel Rangdrol

Mukpo in 1962, son of Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche), since he was born in Bodhgaya India, can be recognised as the official second incarnation of Ju Mipham.

Malcolm wrote:

No, because Bodhgaya is part of an impure realm.

What Mipham was saying in fact that as a Dzogchen practitioner he was going to take rebirth in the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels, but not here, on this planet or in this world system.

gregkavarnos said:

Aha! So what you are saying is not that the three statements are contradictory but that they are complementary. Yes, I can see that. So you are saying that the statement: "...seek me in the northern lands of distant Uttarakuru, and elsewhere, east, west, north and south." is figurative and not literal?

Malcolm wrote:

Uttarakuru, as Mipham surely conceived it, is not this planet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 10:44 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Isn't Meru Cosmology symbolic, rather than simply wrong, old superstition, etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

It was taken literally until 1959 by most Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

I have supplied this answer a few times.

From the Dzogchen perspective, everything, including consciousness, is a merely a display of the basis' energetic radiance.

I don't find that statement "easier." I'm not even sure what "easier" means. But really it's not that critical. In that frame of speaking, sentience doesn't even come into question, and saying any being is sentient or not sentient is unfounded.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that all life is a function of rtsal. Since everything is a display of rtsal, the

notion of sentient vs. non-sentient is not just an ultimate mistake, but a conventional one as well.

You should examine *Plants as People* by Hall. Much of this conversation is colored by a trenchant post-Aristotelian zoocentrism.

Plants are sentient, we might just have to revise our understanding of what sentience is.

In this respect Buddhist dogmatics is of no use and should be discarded the same way we have discarded Meru Cosmology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 10:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

If not, then do you really think that the animals who are sacrificed are treated worse than your dinner was on a factory farm?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in general (but not always) animals used in such ritual sacrifices are then consumed. It is the same actually in Dakshinkali in Katmandhu. From my point of view, blood sacrifices are based on a mistaken concept. But I think anyone from one of these religions where blood sacrifice is common who comes to practice Dzogchen teachings will understand that and eventually cease. However, please do bear in mind that the Lhasa Govt. hired non-Buddhist priests to sacrifice bulls yearly to satiate the bloodthirsty gods and demons of Tibet prior to 1959.

As for gyalpos, not all gyalpos are "bad". ChNN makes that point frequently.

As I said, any person from any religion, who is interested to study and practice Dzogchen may do so without having to convert to Buddhism.

Anyway, I am not going to lend any further dignity to this thread because it was clearly conceived polemically, with religious hostility, and I am not interested pursuing this thread any further.

I leave you to your own devices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Now how does this work with the claim that any religion can come and study

Dzogchen?[/b]

Malcolm wrote:

I never made that claim. Religions are not people.

What I said was that anyone, regardless of religion, who is interested may come and study Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Adamantine said:

In another thread, Malcolm states:

Malcolm wrote:

I have already spoken to you about your rhetorical flourishes. BTW, when is last time you molested a child?

See? I am not answering this question because it is just a screed.

Your question is like Fox News.

Adamantine said:

No, Malcolm, that reply is so weak it means you must have no adequate response. Saying my "rhetorical flourishes" are like Fox News" is your own rhetorical flourish worthy of Fox News. What I was asking, as I said, is no more than bringing your statements to a logical extreme.. this is a common form of Buddhist dialogue, you should be familiar with that as much as anyone! So don't be so disingenuous!

Malcolm wrote:

I am not going to answer that barrage of questions in the manner in which it was asked. You may try to rephrase the question(s) if you like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Now, also in terms of Dzogchen being beyond cause and result, beyond the two stages.. I understand the theory but how does this actually function practically?

Because you need someone to give pointing out instructions.. that is a cause.. don't we

need merit to enable us to connect to a qualified teacher who has the capacity to do this? Or are you saying it is just mere chance? randomness?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a cause of your primordial state. That is a cause of meeting the teachings.

Adamantine said:

right. but we are talking about practicing Dzogchen now, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Practicing Dzogchen means first of all; recognizing your primordial state -- and for that purpose we can use many methods but all of them will be connected with mind since we have not yet gone beyond mind. When we have that recognition practice consists in integrating that knowledge directly with practices that go beyond mind.

Ati Guru Yoga can be and is for both.

Adamantine said:

Because in other threads you've created a whole lot of rhetoric around the supreme path of pure Dzogchen vs. tantric Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I haven't. But some people, like you, have assumed that I was.

Dzogchen proper has its methods. Mahāyoga and Anuyoga likewise have their methods. The latter are based on transformation, the former is not. Dzogchen practitioners can use all of these methods, and more.

Adamantine said:

I would guess, if you don't need it, you're already enlightened.. or 100% integrated, whatever language you want to use. I don't think we need to hash these things out on behalf of Buddhas, these issues are for us who still have the need to practice something.

Malcolm wrote:

You should practice whatever you feel is important for you. Afterall, you know your own condition best.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

You know that's Malcom's blog, right, rai?
(That Malcom is this Malcom. Just making sure...)

Malcolm wrote:
It's a fair question.

The answer is that I have changed my mind. I don't support that position anymore.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:44 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"
Content:
Adamantine said:
In another thread, Malcolm states:

Malcolm wrote:
I have already spoken to you about your rhetorical flourishes. BTW, when is last time you molested a child?

See? I am not answering this question because it is just a screed.

Your question is like Fox News.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:41 AM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:

Son said:
Actually, the beings dwelling in the Sphere of Infinite Space have consciousness and perception. The beings dwelling in the Sphere of Infinite consciousness also have consciousness--(how did you miss that in your expert study?). In the Sphere of Nothingness, there is also perception. In the Sphere of Neither Perception nor Non-Perception is where dwell the beings without perception, who are thus cut off from other existences.

Malcolm wrote:
As I said, according to the Kosha, beings in the ārupyadhātu do not possess physical sense organs; they possess a mental faculty, a consciousness and single mental object (the concentration which propells their rebirth). They likewise possess only three faculties (indriya)-- the mental faculty, the life faculty, and the faculty of equanimity.

Your argument was about self-awareness. Formless realm beings have none.

Son said:

The distinction between fruition of consciousness (karma) and projection of consciousness is thereby defined.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen perspective is much easier.

Son said:

... Sounds good?

Malcolm wrote:

I have supplied this answer a few times.

From the Dzogchen perspective, everything, including consciousness, is a merely a display of the basis' energetic radiance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen "without Buddhism"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Now, also in terms of Dzogchen being beyond cause and result, beyond the two stages.. I understand the theory but how does this actually function practically?

Because you need someone to give pointing out instructions.. that is a cause.. don't we need merit to enable us to connect to a qualified teacher who has the capacity to do this? Or are you saying it is just mere chance? randomness?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a cause of your primordial state. That is a cause of meeting the teachings.

Adamantine said:

Also, in the case of ChNN's instructions, we are given precise instructions, that involve a visualization. You say Guru Yoga of the White Ah is all anyone needs, and they can subscribe to any religion, etc. whatever. But how is making the effort to properly visualize a white Ah in a rainbow ticle not making use of effort, or a cause?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, in the beginning you are working with mind through a simple visualization, but it is not a cause of your primordial state, it is method of connecting with and working with the transmission, a method for directly entering that knowledge.

Adamantine said:

What is so radically different?

Malcolm wrote:

Even Ati Guru Yoga is a method. If you don't need, you don't have to use it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Actually, the beings dwelling in the Sphere of Infinite Space have consciousness and perception. The beings dwelling in the Sphere of Infinite consciousness also have consciousness--(how did you miss that in your expert study?). In the Sphere of Nothingness, there is also perception. In the Sphere of Neither Perception nor Non-Perception is where dwell the beings without perception, who are thus cut off from other existences.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, according to the Kosha, beings in the ārupyadhātu do not possess physical sense organs; they possess a mental faculty, a consciousness and single mental object (the concentration which propells their rebirth). They likewise possess only three faculties (indriya)-- the mental faculty, the life faculty, and the faculty of equanimity.

Your argument was about self-awareness. Formless realm beings have none.

Son said:

The distinction between fruition of consciousness (karma) and projection of consciousness is thereby defined.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen perspective is much easier.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a buddhist.

David N. Snyder said:

Just curious, if you are not Buddhist, which religion / path do you identify with?

If it is just about not wanting to be labeled the R word (religion) which path is closest to your views?

Malcolm wrote:

I am a Dzogchen practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Who are you to say, "the Buddha used devas as a rationalization of plant sentience?"

Malcolm wrote:

Who are you to say he wasn't?

Son said:

Just a guy who has studied the canons.

Malcolm wrote:

So have I.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think that there is a world of difference between pruning an olive tree and cutting the leg off a living cow.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you don't prune cows.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but your point has little bearing on the original meaning of the MPSN sutra as a text in its own right, apart from the various sectarian uses and interpretations of it there may be been. I was discussing the fact that originally the MPNS introduced a eternalism into Buddhism.

M

Will said:

Yes, and I am discussing the last 1500 years or so of influence of the larger standard, popular sutra. Conversely, your scholarly point "has little bearing" on my point.

Ah, if only the pointless Dzogchenpa would reappear.

Malcolm wrote:

Well you and I both know that the very few people actually read these texts, like Astus (and me, etc.), tend to cherry pick them to make their points. My consideration here is simply to point out to Astus that his citations come from a part of the sutra found only in Chinese sources.

Therefore, they have little bearing on the essential subject of this thread, as I understand it i.e. the presence of a Buddhist eternalism in India. So I suspect we are not having the same conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

...support them with Buddhist sources.

Malcolm wrote:

I did that. I also made it clear that I don't agree with the later Buddhist scholastics and why.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

you have to take into account that you are posting in the general Dharma section of a Buddhist forum

Malcolm wrote:

This is the free for all section greg.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

UCalling plants sentient just adds another layer of grief to human behaviour, since now it becomes ethically ambivalent whether it is okay to "kill" plants. It becomes a source of mental grief and doubt. In order to maintain ethical conduct we would have to adopt the behaviour of Jains.

Malcolm wrote:

Harming plants and killing animals (requiring only simple confession) are considered the same class of infractions in monastic vows, so this is an exaggeration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Will said:

The view of "specialist scholars" is not relevant to the influence on the buddhadharma & generations of practitioners of the "standard" sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that part of the sutra under question, which "normalizes" the view of the MPNS does not seem to be present in any other recension. It certainly is not in the Tibetan version. Based in that, we can consider that the original Tathagatagarbha theory was fully eternalist.

Will said:

Sounds like an old Namdrol "point" - my point is different.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but your point has little bearing on the original meaning of the MPNS sutra as a text in its own right, apart from the various sectarian uses and interpretations of it there may be been. I was discussing the fact that originally the MPNS introduced a eternalism into Buddhism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Astus said:

Malcolm,

In fact, at the final part it has explanations on the differentiation between what is void and what is non-void.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, from the section regarded as apocryphal which has no correspondence in any other early version of the sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, from a statement by Padmasambhava in a Dzogchen teaching that the distinction between sentient and non-sentient appears, but should not be believed, and that when enters into full awakening, the distinction between sentient and non-sentient being false, vanishes.

gregkavarnos said:

It doesn't vanish by calling plants sentient, it just takes plants from within the category of non-sentient and puts them into the category of sentient. Making the distinction between sentient and non-sentient vanish is also not achieved by saying that everything is sentient. No more than saying everything is eternal makes the distinction between eternal and impermanent vanish.

Malcolm wrote:

Padmasambhava is saying that ignorance is maintaining that there is a meaningful distinction between the so called sentient and non-sentient. Plants, rocks, trees, and galaxies all have the same primordial state as humans, and other so called beings in the six lokas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...

the two truths and the two stages are not the system of Dzogchen...

heart said:

That part is clear enough, but this relation to Mahayoga/Anuyoga that is so valuable and still irrelevant leaves a lot of questions.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Not for me. Mahayoga and Anuyoga are not my path. They can be someone else's path, but they are not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

so from what are you building this idea? That is something I am interested in and is the reason I'm in this discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, from a statement by Padmasambhava in a Dzogchen teaching that the distinction between sentient and non-sentient appears, but should not be believed, and that when enters into full awakening, the distinction between sentient and non-sentient being false, vanishes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Will said:

The view of "specialist scholars" is not relevant to the influence on the buddhadharma & generations of practitioners of the "standard" sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that part of the sutra under question, which "normalizes" the view of the MPNS does not seem to be present in any other recension. It certainly is not in the Tibetan version. Based on that, we can consider that the original Tathagatagarbha theory was fully eternalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Instead, we hear him say, "they do not have self-awareness."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this simply means they are not aware of the themselves; likewise, unconscious gods and so called formless realm gods have no self-awareness.

Son said:

That is not true. And that is not written.

Malcolm wrote:

It most certainly is true --according the Abhidharmakosha (something I am a little expert in) formless realm beings for example have only one thought and have no awareness outside of that thought, i.e. the thought that propels them into that ayatana. Why? Because they have no physical sense faculties. Hence they have no self-reflexive cognition of any kind. But, like plants, they are a birth, albeit, one without self-knowledge.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Who are you to say, "the Buddha used devas as a rationalization of plant sentience?"

Malcolm wrote:

Who are you to say he wasn't?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Instead, we hear him say, "they do not have self-awareness."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this simply means they are not aware of the themselves; likewise, unconscious gods and so called formless realm gods have no self-awareness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

I don't know what kind of approach that is, but it doesn't seem Buddhistic.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 6th, 2012 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to Hodge there are two distinct sections. It seems you are citing from parts that are not regarded as core portions, but rather later interpolations meant to bring the MPNS in line with a more standard "Buddhist read:

However, Dharmakṣema's translation of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra extends for a further thirty juan beyond the accepted core text of this sutra. The provenance and authenticity of the Sanskrit text, if such existed, underlying this part of his translation has been debated amongst scholars for decades, with many doubting that it is a text of Indian origin. The chief reasons for this skepticism are these: no traces of a extended Sanskrit text has ever been found, while Sanskrit manuscript fragments of twenty four separate pages distributed right across the core portion of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra have been found over the past hundred years in various parts of Asia; no quotations are known from this latter portion in any Indian commentaries or sutra anthologies; and no other translator in China or Tibet ever found Sanskrit copies of this portion.[12]:12-13 The Chinese monk-translator Yijing travelled widely through India and parts South East Asia over a twenty-five year period. In his account of "Eminent Monks who Went West in Search of the Dharma" (大唐西域求法高僧傳 T2066), he mentions that he searched for a copy of the enlarged Mahaparinirvāṇa-sūtra through all that time, but only found manuscripts corresponding to the core portion of this work.[5] For these reasons, textual scholars generally regard the authenticity of the latter portion as dubious: they surmise it may have been a local Central Asian composition at best or else written by Dharmakṣema himself who had both the ability and the motive for doing so.[5]:124-5[14] As a consequence, specialist scholars accept that this latter portion of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra translated by Dharmakṣema has no value for the history of the tathāgata-garbha concept and related doctrines during their development in India.[12][6]:163-4

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mahayana_Mahaparinirvana_Sutra "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Son of Buddha said:

emptiness isn't considered dharmadhatu in tathagatagarbha, (the nirvana sutra/Lotus sutra) states it was teachings to help one end tainted individual self(false self) not the actual goal.

Astus said:

Consider these passages from the Nirvana Sutra. Page number is according to the common PDF edition.

"The Truth is the Tathagata. The Tathagata is the True; the True is the Void; the Void is the True; the True is the Buddha-Nature; the Buddha-Nature is the True."
(p. 159)

"O good man! All that is made is not eternal. The Void is not anything made. So, it is eternal. The Buddha-Nature is not what is made. So, it is eternal. "The Void is the Buddha-Nature; the Buddha-Nature is the Tathagata; the Tathagata is not what has been made. What has not been made is Eternal."
(p. 162)

"How does the Bodhisattva meditate on the Void of nature ["prakrti-shunyata" - Emptiness of primordial matter]? This Bodhisattva-mahasattva sees that the original nature of all elements is all void. These are the five skandhas, the 18 realms, the 12 spheres, the Eternal, the non-Eternal, suffering, Bliss, the Pure, the impure, Self, and non-Self. In all such things, he sees no nature of their own. This is how the Bodhisattva-mahasattva meditates on the Void of nature."
(p. 194)

"When the Bodhisattva-mahasattva practises Great Nirvana, he knows and sees the universe and he realises that the real state is all-void and that there is nothing that one possesses, and that there is nothing that has any mode of harmonisation or perception. And what he gains is such a phase [state of realisation] as the unbreakable [i.e. undefiled], non-doing, the phantomic, the burning flame of the hot season, and the all-empty phase of a gandharvan castle."
(p. 257)

"He practises "Paramartha-satya" [Ultimate Reality] and the Ultimate Void. Why? Because all Bodhisattvas always thoroughly practise the natures and characteristics of the Void. By practising the Void, he can now know what he did not know in the past. What does he know? He knows that there is no self and what one possesses. All beings have the Buddha-Nature. He knows that by reason of the Buddha-Nature, even the icchantika, when he abandons the mind that he possesses, can indeed attain unsurpassed Enlightenment. Such is not what sravakas and pratyekabuddhas can know."
(p. 282)

"Now, hearing Dharma relates to the 11 shunyatas. Due to these voids, we see no form in anything. Now, hearing Dharma begins with the first aspiration and proceeds up to the ultimate unsurpassed Bodhi Mind. By gaining the first aspiration, one gains Great Nirvana. Through hearing, one does not gain Great Nirvana; by practising, one attains Great Nirvana."

(p. 293)

"What is the True? One knows well the phases of Nirvana, the Buddha-Nature, the Tathagata, Dharma, the priest, the Real State, and the Void. This is what is True."

(p. 296)

"The Buddha-Nature is none other than the All-Void of "Paramartha-satya" [Ultimate Truth]. The All-Void of "Paramartha-satya" is Wisdom. We say "All-Void".

(p. 318)

"The Middle Path is the Buddha-Nature. For this reason, the Buddha-Nature is Eternal and there is no change. As ignorance overspreads [them], all beings are unable to see. The sravaka and pratyekabuddha see the All-Void of all things. But they do not see the non-Void. Or they see the non-Self of all things, but they do not see the Self. Because of this, they are unable to gain the All-Void of "Paramartha-satya". Since they fail to gain the All-Void of "Paramartha-satya", they fail to enact the Middle Path. Since there is no Middle Path, there is no seeing of the Buddha- Nature."

(p. 319)

"The samadhi resultant from right thinking is right meditation. One abiding in right meditation sees all things as Void. This is right Wisdom. One perfect in right Wisdom segregates his self from all the bonds of defilement. This is Emancipation. "The person who has gained Emancipation praises it to all beings and says that this Emancipation is Eternal and Unchanging. This is the correct praising of Emancipation. This is unsurpassed Mahaparinirvana."

(p. 327)

"The Buddha-Nature of beings is not-one and not-two. The equality spoken of regarding all Buddhas is like the Void. All beings possess it. Anybody who indeed practises the Noble Eightfold Path gains - one should know - a bright view."

(p. 352)

"The Eternal of the Tathagata is the Self. The Dharmakaya "[Dharma-Body]" of the Tathagata is unboundedness, unobstructedness, birthlessness, undyingness, and the eight unmolestednesses. This is the Self. The beings, truth to tell, do not have such a Self and what the Self possesses. Only because of the fact that a person absolutely attains the absolute Void of "Paramartha-satya" do we say the Buddha-Nature."

(p. 389)

"The Buddha-Nature of the being is like the Void. The Void is not past, not future, and not present. it is not in, nor out; it is not within the boundaries of colour, sound, taste, and

touch. It is the same with the Buddha-Nature."
(p. 414)

"If there is nothing, this is the Void. The same is the case with the Buddha-Nature, too. O good man! As the Void is empty, it does not fall into the category of the Three Times. As the Buddha-Nature is Eternal, it is not within the category of the Three Times."
(p. 440)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 10:54 PM
Title: Re: Queen's Diamond Jubilee
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
kilt_fail.jpg (53.1 KiB) Viewed 1761 times
kilt_fail.jpg (53.1 KiB) Viewed 1761 times

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 10:39 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Son said:
...and I sincerely think that they are projections of sentience.

Malcolm wrote:
The minute you admit that plants are admitted onto scale of sentience, all of your other arguments are just rationals.

Son said:
Well if you pretend that I mean something other than what I said, yes.

Malcolm wrote:
What you said was...

Son said:
Plants should be considered borderline sentient

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 10:23 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Instead, I prefer to think that matter is intrinsically imbued with intelligence, and that all forms of matter may naturally manifest their intrinsic intelligence given proper causes and conditions.

gregkavarnos said:

To say that all sentients have form is one thing, to say all forms are sentient is another. Is an asphalt tarmac sentient? Is my desk sentient? The desk lamp? What about the printer? That's a border line case because every time I try to print it seems to have a mind of its own and do whatever it feels like...

Well, it doesn't really work as a theory does it?

Malcolm wrote:

...given proper causes and conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

This seems to be comfortable canonically.

Malcolm wrote:

In scholastic Buddhism this debate came about because Buddha's teachings were more or less silent on the issue, and there are a couple of passages where the Buddha clearly included plant life as a kind of birth.

This raised a question, and because Jains and Hindus already supported the notion of plant sentience, arch-contrarians that they are, Buddhist scholastics rejected this point of view.

You can for example, rationalize that there are devas that inhabit plants as houses (standard Indo-Tibetan view), but as far as I am concerned this is merely a way of articulating the sentience of plants. It may be the case that plants achieve sentience only in communities, just like our body is not wholly sentient -- to use your example of a branch which can be propagated, also cells from our body may be propagated etc., and we certainly would not necessarily call either sentient in a conventional way.

Likewise, we do not have sentience apart from our embodiment, the community of organisms that make up our body. I think the Buddhist basic view -- the sutrayāna view - is that we are embodied because we are sentient. Underlying the whole Buddhist rejection of plant sentience is a hard substance dualism.

Dzogchen rejects this substance dualism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Okay, does that conflict with something you read?

Malcom,

There are many practices and levels of depth the Buddha taught.

However, they do not conflict with each other. We can't compare the teachings.

There are contradiction when we compare teachings and lineages because of depth.

That is why the buddha said to contemplate a teaching and discard teachings one does not understand.

The higher teachings are not meant to be understood intellectually, they must be experienced.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of higher and lower.

But the fact remains is that the two truths and the two stages are not the system of Dzogchen and are irrelevant in Dzogchen.

heart said:

The obvious question is then why ChNNR would teach on the two stages if it is irrelevant in Dzogchen? Not a long time ago you said that it is possible to integrate any religion or belief with the practice of Dzogchen, if I understood you correctly. The two stages and the two truths should then be easy to integrate with Dzogchen, right?

Then you told me yourself that the two stages are mentioned as practices in the 17 Tantras. The Kunjed Gyalpo is full of references to the two stages even if it is as a way to define the difference between Mahayoga/Anuyoga and Dzogchen I don't think that the word "irrelevant" is at all appropriate.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Jesus, do we really have to go round and round on this one again? You know what I mean when I say "The two stages are irrelevant to Dzogchen".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you are interested, you should check out Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, my teacher. He does many free and open webcasts every year. Open does not mean "less profound". Usually, when something is restricted, it is less profound, and more connected with Vajrayāna methods rather than pure Dzogchen.

heart said:

A wise man said recently;

Malcolm wrote:

According to ChNN, the idea of a "pure Dzogchen" is a mistake. He also says we need to understand our practice in terms of the unity of the three inner tantras. Dzogchen is how we practice those three inner tantras.

N

heart said:

But here you are again back to "pure dzogchen".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

By "pure Dzogchen" I simply mean from the three series of Dzogchen proper, rather than the result vehicle approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

I just ordered the Guru Yoga e-book (I think Dechen Norbu mentioned in one of his posts some time ago). I just started reading and came across the oral, symbolic, direct transmissions.

During webcasts, does Rinpoche always give all three? I know he often gives oral and symbolic transmission but what about direct transmission?

Many thanks,

C

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:43 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

Is it knowledge? This is a serious question. Because I describe it more as a sort of wild unfocused stumbling, like a drunken bee in a California poppy.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know Zen at all. I am a Dzogchen practitioner. I know what my state is. For the most part I am connected with that state. It is based on personal experience.

mujushinkyo said:

Yes! I don't know Zen at all either. Don't think I'm asking about Zen or Dzogchen. I was just asking about the direct experience, because it intrigues me.

Not a challenge or a demand -- or anything of the sort

As you know, I expect. Because if we're talking about the same thing, we needn't have our discussion "here" at all -- we can meet anytime in Infinity.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are interested, you should check out Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, my teacher. He does many free and open webcasts every year. Open does not mean "less profound". Usually, when something is restricted, it is less profound, and more connected with Vajrayāna methods rather than pure Dzogchen.

This is the best thing.

Otherwise, the best thing I can say is: that direct experience is based on direct introduction by a qualified teacher (These days most Dzogchen teachers will be very interested in having you sign on as a Buddhist, but not ChNN). Having received direct introduction, then there are many methods to come to be free of doubt about one's primordial state. Once one is free of doubt, one ceases to worry about buddhahood that is a result of practice and effort, since it does not exist.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:25 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

Is it knowledge? This is a serious question. Because I describe it more as a sort of wild unfocused stumbling, like a drunken bee in a California poppy.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know Zen at all. I am a Dzogchen practitioner. I know what my state is. For the most part I am connected with that state. It is based on personal experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:19 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I personally have no idea what satori is. All I know is what my primordial state is.

mujushinkyo said:

That's what it is.

But satori is what happens if "you" are ever unlucky enough to stray in an illusory way from your primordial state and then suddenly rejoin it with an anti- illusory big bang.

Malcolm wrote:

That used to happen. Now it does not happen anymore because I am not separate from that knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:12 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

What are the infallible signs of someone having had kensho?

This is an interesting topic for a Dharma discussion board. Maybe much more interesting than the depredations of a group of cultists.

Malcolm wrote:

Just saying, it is easy for people to say anything.

mujushinkyo said:

That's true!

Listen, the only reason I invest Kensho with any significance is that it does liberate people to be happier. I've seen it happen in others. I'm happy.

It's hard to get across to anyone just what this is, because people want to know instead what it "means." It doesn't mean anything. It's just waking up to the glory of This. If it were a religious issue -- a personal possession, an attainment of "holiness" -- we could argue about who has it and who doesn't.

This is actually basic to the cult stalking I experienced. The cultists were enraged that I said I'd had kensho. Enraged.

There's no way to convince anybody of what they refuse to accept, but if there's someone who claims they know the difference between a person who's had satori and who hasn't, let's hear it!

Malcolm wrote:

I personally have no idea what satori is. All I know is what my primordial state is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:00 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

What are the infallible signs of someone having had kensho?

This is an interesting topic for a Dharma discussion board. Maybe much more interesting than the depredations of a group of cultists.

Malcolm wrote:

Just saying, it is easy for people to say anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 11:44 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

I hate to break it to you, because you seem attached to your idea of kensho,

kirtu said:

nope, not an idea of kensho.

I had wu/satori.

From your speech and topics of concern, you are deeply mistaken. And are behaving in a mistaken way.

Kirt

mujushinkyo said:

Kirt, Let me ask. Have you had Kensho?

Or Satori?

"Nope."

It's all just a religious, idealistic concept to you, isn't it?

Are you not behaving in mistaken way, by telling any other person they are behaving in a mistaken way?

Look into it clearly. You're missing something here, and it could be important for you to find out what it is.

Andrew

Malcolm wrote:

Here, I should say, this is unproductive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 11:41 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

My response: Some of you little Buddhist scamps here are worse than the worst Catholics. You're crazed -- totally sunk in an anti-life religious ascetic delusion.

Malcolm wrote:

Well that is a bit of an exaggeration, but yes -- Buddhism is a pretty alienating religion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 11:15 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

...and I sincerely think that they are projections of sentience.

Malcolm wrote:

The minute you admit that plants are admitted onto scale of sentience, all of your other arguments are just rationals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Nemo said:

Isn't it a bit ironic posting that?

So what you are saying is ignore the problem, blame ourselves and it will go away?

Malcolm wrote:

Hence the Tibetan Institutional Response (TIR). Lojong teachings are often used as Mind Control. Milarepa had good reason to call Dromton a demon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Thanks Malcolm...sometimes its difficult for some of us newbies to strike a balance between being precise/anal and being hippy-dippy/anything goes. So then my new avatar that I worked on with my sons help for many hours should be fine then, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Looks good to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Chiefly, it is crucial to understand that plants are not self-aware, and therefore are not sentient in the way that humans, animals, or devas are considered sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

But, to raise yet another objection, shamanic traditions clearly are at odds with this view.

Son said:

I am very well integrated into shamanism and study with shamans.

In that experience, I can say that no it is not. As a shamanist I can say that it's not at odds with this view. In fact, according to myself and other shamanists I've interacted

with, this completely validates these aspects of shamanism from a Buddhist mentality. Maybe if you explained what's on your mind?

Malcolm wrote:

There are a lot of different kinds of shamanism -- but specifically, plants have their own energetic resonance. Since we moderns have a deeply ingrained substance dualism, when we see terms like "plant spirits" we assume this means somehow just like a mind appropriates a body, spirits appropriate a given set of plants -- but in my view as a Dzogchen practitioner, it is not like that. So how is it? Humans are living beings, and our consciousness is an expression of how energy is instantiated in our forms. Plants are living beings, and the way energy is instantiated in their forms is not the same as ours, so too with animals, devas, etc. But this energy, call it rtsal, permeates and gives rise to all displays of life in a samsaric context, and buddhas in a nirvanic context. You can set them out them on a band if you like, for example, as some hindus do, tamasic to sattvic with plant inhabiting the tamasic end of the consciousness scale, and liberated beings at the ultimate sattvic end.

To think like a tree can take centuries -- Garab Dorje says "The color of rtsal is green". Without rtsal there is no growth, no flourishing of anything. Rtsal is the root of consciousness. Tree thoughts are not like human thoughts. For most of us, we are closed off. We cannot perceive how a tree thinks, or a mountain, a planet, a solar system, galaxy or universe.

All universes are supposed to be included inside of the body of the mahāsambhogakāya Vairocana Himasagara. Our world system is supposed to be in a billion world system that is part of another system which is in the palm of his hand. Are we truly sentient in that respect? Or are we just neurons, synapses in a massive cosmos spanning Buddha?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 9:12 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Chiefly, it is crucial to understand that plants are not self-aware, and therefore are not sentient in the way that humans, animals, or devas are considered sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

But, to raise yet another objection, shamanic traditions clearly are at odds with this view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:
so then this is not correct for visualization for Longsal Longde?

Malcolm wrote:
It is fine. The principle is more important than the details.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 7:43 AM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Son said:
So, what is your answer to that? Are you on my page or not?

Malcolm wrote:
My answer to that if it is alive, it is sentient. So we are not on the same page, since you clearly think plants are not alive, and I think they are.

:=)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 7:31 AM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Son said:
If the plant is the sentient beings form-body, than that means the deva can't move or touch anything that doesn't touch the plant...

Malcolm wrote:
I am not advocating substance dualism at all. That is a Buddhist trip. I am saying that plant sentience is articulated through the language of plant "spirits" in the jatakas. And that there is a very clear relationship between the body of the plant and the life of the plant "spirit" in question. Harm one, harm the other.

Likewise, when your body is harmed, also your mind experiences harm.

My point of view is not informed by the early Buddhist tradition -- it is merely that in this period there was no hard and fast doctrinal position about it and even the Abhidharmika Samghabhadra recognizes that in the earliest sources there is no firm opinion to back up the Buddhist rejection of non-Buddhist assertions about plant sentience.

So therefore, when Buddhists such as yourself claim "Plants are not sentient" -- it is actually far more ambiguous than is comfortable for you.

As for my position, everything is made of five elements, and that is permeated with wisdom. Therefore, plant sentience, etc., is perfectly reasonable from my perspective and I don't agree with the scholastic arguments against it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 7:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Okay, does that conflict with something you read?

Malcom,

There are many practices and levels of depth the Buddha taught.

However, they do not conflict with each other. We can't compare the teachings.

There are contradiction when we compare teachings and lineages because of depth.

That is why the buddha said to contemplate a teaching and discard teachings one does not understand.

The higher teachings are not meant to be understood intellectually, they must be experienced.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question of higher and lower.

But the fact remains is that the two truths and the two stages are not the system of Dzogchen and are irrelevant in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

it is not the plant that is sentient but the deva.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just like saying that your body is not sentient but your mind is. Of course, those who subscribe to Buddhist substance dualism will be happy with this pov.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

This is where the absolute and relative truths are found.

Malcolm wrote:

Which have nothing to do with Dzogchen.

In the bone yard said:

Oh really?

Malcolm wrote:

Really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Tibetan dharma organizations need to learn a thing or two about accountability if they expect to succeed here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Really?

Malcolm wrote:

Really:

“Since thou art bent to tear my body from me, cut me small,
And cut me piecemeal limb from limb, O King, or not at all.

“Cut first the top, the middle next, then last the root of me:
And if thou cut me so, O King, death will not painful be.”

...

“The reason (and a reason ’tis full noble) why piecemeal
I would be cut, O mighty king! Come listen while I tell.

“My kith and kin all prospering round me well-sheltered grow:

These I should crush by one huge fall,—and great would be their woe.”

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

Yes. It is. Plants do not experience. They don't have the storehouse consciousness, they don't have the element of consciousness but are only form. Indeed, the Hindus called them "one-facultied life." In Buddhism, life cannot have one faculty, that of body.

Malcolm wrote:

They are talking about sparśendriya, the faculty of touch.

Also in this Jataka, a tree deva clearly identifies his tree as his body, which when cut down, will end his life:

http://jathakakatha.org/english/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=332:453-bhaddasala-jataka-&catid=51:451-500&Itemid=99 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not saying that. I am saying do UHC/SP right or don't do it. Don't do a half-assed job that in end only serves to enrich HMO's and create needless beauracracy. You have no idea what a burden Romney/Obamacare is on many lower income people in Mass.

kirtu said:

I understand. And when can we expect your candidacy for the MA legislature in order to amend the state heathcare system in order to remove the burden on lower income people?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I am pretty sure the USCUS will force a doover of the whole mess.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

Thanks, but the tiple in dronmas post is space, air, fire, earth, water is that correct or not?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as it should be IN THE THUN SYSTEM.

LONGSAL is different.

M

Finney said:

Malcolm,

Here you seem to be agreeing that the proper Thun order is: space, air, fire, earth, water.

But earlier you wrote:

Malcolm wrote:

The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam)

Finney said:

so, I'm a little confused. Can you help clarify it for me?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh I see... I was not paying careful attention. Also Tbhun cover is out of order. There is no system where water is last. That is just for aesthetics. It has been like that for 30 years. Since Crystal. My bad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But I'll be damned if I am going to be forced to pay some insurance company for health insurance I damn well don't need and won't use.

kirtu said:

Just another version of: why should I help pay for other people's health care? IOW you are selfish and only looking out for yourself given this condition. Or as President Obama said: some people believe that "you are on your own" and that's the way things should be.

Anyway everyone is 100% guaranteed to use health care.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I am not saying that. I am saying do UHC/SP right or don't do it. Don't do a half-assed job that in end only serves to enrich HMO's and create needless beauracracy. You have no idea what a burden Romney/Obamacare is on many lower income people in Mass.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

...the order of the colors of the 5 elements depends on the practice.

[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are correct: there are two systems.

The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam)

The Longsal system (which is the classical order of Indian cosmology): space, air, fire, water, earth (e yam ram bam lam).

Also these very same seed syllables in the latter system are also found in precisely the same order in Hindu element purification practice.

Mr. G said:

If we're doing an Anuyoga practice, we would use the one in the thun?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends: if you are doing an Anuyoga practice like Jnanadakini you use the Longsal system. If you are doing something not connected with Longsal, you use Thun system. The system used in the Thun book comes from lower tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

heart said:

Thanks, but the tiple in dronmas post is space, air, fire, earth, water is that correct or not?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, as it should be IN THE THUN SYSTEM.

LONGSAL is different.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 4:02 AM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Son said:
They are still subject to consciousness, they're just in a suspended state.

Malcolm wrote:
Specious-- one could make the same argument for plants.

Just admit it -- the Buddha includes plants as a kind of jati, a kind of birth, right along side all the other births.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 3:59 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

Sönam said:
As a french guy, I also do not understand that point of view ... as for payement, in France, as the rights are established depending on your salary the richs pay more, and the poor do not pay at all ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:
"Most general physicians are in private practice but draw their income from the public insurance funds. These funds, unlike their German counterparts, have never gained self-management responsibility. Instead, the government has taken responsibility for the financial and operational management of health insurance (by setting premium levels related to income and determining the prices of goods and services refunded)"

I have no problem with this --but Obamacare is not this.

Obamacare was set up by HMOs for HMOs

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

This is a kind of thinking that is just incomprehensible to me. And many people born and raised in the US repeat this.

Malcolm wrote:

Either give health care to everyone (UHC/SP), or don't give it to anyone. But I'll be damned if I am going to be forced to pay some insurance company for health insurance I damn well don't need and won't use. Moreover, I am completely opposed to the present HMO system.

I really hope they do toss out Obama care on its ear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

...the order of the colors of the 5 elements depends on the practice.

[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you are correct: there are two systems.

The Thun system: space, air, water, fire, earth. (e yam bam ram lam)

The Longsal system (which is the classical order of Indian cosmology): space, air, fire, water, earth (e yam ram bam lam).

Also these very same seed syllables in the latter system are also found in precisely the same order in Hindu element purification practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Isn't a lack of self awareness a description of non-sentience? Of course plants are

"born" but, like I said before, let us not confound living with sentience.

Malcolm wrote:

By your definition unconscious gods would then be non-sentient, as would people in comas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Anders said:

Multiply by several orders of magnitude for Big Stuff like culture, religion, etc. I suppose. Someone on Youtube actually took offence at the 'Sickest Buddhist Ever' video.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, or Buddha prints on bakinis. The fact is that a Buddha image on some cute girl's (or boy's) ass might waken a trace in someone and cause them to investigate the teachings.

Tathāgata Booty Beauty Buddha.

Click at your own risk:

<https://hediedformygrins.blogspot.com/2011/12/buddha-bikini.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Do Theravadins have anything similar to Dzogchen?

Content:

Anders said:

I think that may be a reflection of your inclination on topics moreso than theirs.

Jnana said:

Not at all. It's a pluralistic world Anders. I know practicing Theravāda monastics who do Green Tārā Sādhana every evening, etc., etc..

Malcolm wrote:

Thank goodness it is a pluralistic world -- let's keep it that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Do Theravadins have anything similar to Dzogchen?

Content:

Anders said:

You're skipping a number of steps though. Vajrayana doesn't accept this for the same reasons Mahayana doesn't. Simply being awakened doesn't constitute a shortcut to Buddhahood. Buddhahood is predicated on taking much longer than arhatship because of the two accumulations even though their practise of wisdom is basically the same.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen model of abhisamaya is so different from Nikāya, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna abhisamaya it is basically completely meaningless to discuss them on the same basis. Anyone at all can practice Dzogchen irrespective of their religious tradition.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

Anders said:

Ergo, an appreciation of culture and the diversity of culture, in the right perspective of it being a play of celebration and expression of life, can be a delightful thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Buddhists are too depressing and gloomy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: The Mahaparinirvana Sutra

Content:

Spirituality said:

That was way more than necessary, but clear, at least in this translation. You're right: in this translation this sutra does teach Buddha is eternal and is, as such, hard to reconcile with traditional Buddhism.

I'd love to hear what someone with access to the original language who knows something of the Buddhist history of ideas has to say about this text.

Anders said:

IIRC, when https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Stephen_Hodge posted on E-sangha, his position was that the Nirvana sutra was rather unapologetic about its eternalism.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and he is perhaps THE expert on this text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

Unfortunately overturning Obamas's healthcare proposal or Romney's implementation of healthcare is not guaranteed to move the US to a single payer system. Culturally US people really do believe that the principle that "you are on your own" is correct. Therefore most Republicans and many Democrats (almost all of whom are merely liberal Republicans anyway) agree with this point of view.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

AFAIC am concerned, that is better than mandated insurance coverage which I regard as a violation of my rights to choose and as something that makes Govt, interference in our lives all the more pervasive since it is tied to our income taxes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Anders said:

At a more fundamental level though, it does seem to imply that spirits can embody a vessel in similar fashion to the way we 'embody' a car and move around in it, the step out when we're done with it. I can imagine a similar principle could be applied to spirits and plants.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and minds and bodies, and so the substance dualism of Abhidharma remains in force.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Which is why I originally asked why the Buddha did not include plants as a seventh realm of samsaric existence if they were considered sentient by him...

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha includes "grass and trees" among "birth" i.e. jati.

Know first the grass and trees:

Though they lack self-awareness,

Their birth is their distinctive mark;

For many are the kinds of birth.

-- Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha, pg. 800

Here, Buddha clearly includes plants among the "born". He continues next with moths up to ants, and so on. But if you read this without bias, he says later, on pg. 806:

Who knows his manifold past lives,

And sees the heavens and states of woe,

Who has reached the destruction of birth,

He is the one I call a bhramin.

Since plants are included among birth here, I see no reason not to understand that they are possible rebirths though lacking self-knowing (na cāpi paṭijānare), also so called formless realm beings lack self-knowing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In response to Xabir, the idea that plants have "spirits" inhabiting them is as silly as the idea we are a mind inhabiting a body.

xabir said:

What happens then when a person gets possessed by evil spirits so that the body gets taken control by another mindstream, or a taoist medium gets possessed by spirit-deities, or a tibetan oracle gets possessed by protectors etc? Can't the same happen for plants?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but invasion implies force, and in the case of all three examples, you have the invasion of a foreign entity into another entity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 5th, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

The Seeker said:

Andres, I'm not saying that they don't "move" to follow the sun.
But they do it in a solid location being rooted i. That location.

Malcom, yes Mycelium Running is a great book full of information. I also consider the fungi world entirely different from any other realm. Having studied and being certified in professional mushroom cultivation by Stamets, I'd have to say the fungi would have more characteristic tendencies of sentience than plants. Also in response to pulling the weeds being displacing the insects home. One is not making an area bare, there are other plants and root systems for them to reside in. Which most likely, they "visit" anyway.

Kindest wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

well, tell that to the bug the text time, you pull it up with some roots...The other day i was making some rosewater, and some junebugs crawled out of the rose heads, very indignant, i might add.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I was reflecting this morning sentience is not a function of individual members anyway. It is a function of the interaction of communities, just as our body is a member of a sentient community. It is the interactions of the five elements we can our body through all of its sense organs and so forth than gives rise to our consciousness.

This is why such notions as autopoiesis (lhun grub) are critical for going beyond archaic and alienating notions inherent in the mind/matter dichotomy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Trees communicating and benefiting one another is a cute idea, for sure. Unfortunately it all sounds like speculation, not science. What I find interesting is the idea that trees could communicate through their roots with the help of fungi, but no evidence is presented that they actually do.

Come to think of it, I wouldn't be surprised if this video turned out to be a hoax. But well worth watching.

Malcolm wrote:

Read Mycelium Running: How Mushrooms Can Help Save the World by Paul Stamets

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

But Malcolm - this is the kind of indirectness and abandonment of logical thought that is a real problem in discussions. My point on health care is that the US does not have a health care system (not a universal health care system). So while President Obama's system is also not a universal health care system, Single Payer is certainly not a legitimate option, other than for powerful or greedy people who simply want to exploit others. It's this kind of thinking that we should reduce and not encourage. The US has not always taken an extreme "you are on your own" approach but it seems that it has been moving towards that extreme view since at least the 1st Great Depression (because homeless people and poor people were significantly maltreated in that period).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Single Payer = Universal Health Care in my lexicon i.e. healthcare as a basic human right, a base level of which should be guaranteed by the government, just as the government guarantees education as a basic human right.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

This is a delusion that the Buddha himself tried to put an end to.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not say anything about it at all. All arguments against plant sentience are from later, extra canonical, scholastic sources. There is in fact good evidence to suppose that like other contemporary Indians, early Buddhists believed in the sentience of plants. Certainly Jains did and continue to do so.

Lotus_Bitch said:

What do you think of the Surangama Sutra? Regardless of when and who composed this work, it is widely regarded as a meditation manual first. Hence its importance in Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

The arguments about the sentience of plants in Chinese Mahāyāna is well known with many Chinese masters coming down on the side of plant sentience.

Lotus_Bitch said:

The view you are propounding is common among those of eternalistic views, which is why you'll hear of this in tribal communities as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Am I? That is news to me. Are you quite sure all tribal people are eternalists? How did you come to universal knowledge of the beliefs of all tribal peoples?

In response to Xabir, the idea that plants have "spirits" inhabiting them is as silly as the idea we are a mind inhabiting a body. This is merely a perpetuation of the mind/matter dichotomy, the intractable substance dualism that has infected scholastic Buddhist discourse, with which modern Buddhist authors such as Alan Wallace jump through hoops to vainly defend.

Instead, I prefer to think that matter is intrinsically imbued with intelligence, and that all forms of matter may naturally manifest their intrinsic intelligence given proper causes and conditions. In other words, I think the concepts "sentient" vs. "non-sentient" is just an abstraction. The intelligence of matter is a function of self-organization or autopoiesis. It used to be the case that we believed animals to be mere automata. Now we have revised that view, and we consider that while animals demonstrate will, communication, etc., we feel that plants are mere automata -- but this view is also slowly changing.

My present feeling is that we inhabit a living world, and it too has a consciousness that envelops us. In order to make it comprehensible we render it in archetypes like an Earth Goddess, Pritvi, etc. But the world is impermanent, and thus it too is subject to birth, aging, illness and death.

Why would the intelligence of a mountain, a planet, a solar system, a galaxy, a universe resemble that of a human being?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

The Seeker said:

I can not see how by physically pulling a weed/plant you are harming a worm or bug. Unless of course you don't see it and crush it when grabbing the weed.

Kindest wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you can destroy something's home. If someone plucked your house up by the roots I am sure you would feel harmed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 11:01 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Son said:

This is a delusion that the Buddha himself tried to put an end to.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not say anything about it at all. All arguments against plant sentience are from later, extra canonical, scholastic sources. There is in fact good evidence to suppose that like other contemporary Indians, early Buddhists believed in the sentience of plants. Certainly Jains did and continue to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: The Value of Culture

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I see little value in preserving elements of a culture that have become redundant, especially if these elements are at odds with other cultures.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, we should just have one color of corn. Who needs diverse corn to make high fructose corn syrup? After all who needs Glass Gem Corn:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Child Abuse Rampant in Sinhalese Monasteries

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-south-asia-15507304> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

...BUT Sakyong Jamgon Mipham Rinpoche, Jampal Trinley Dradul (born Osel Rangdrol Mukpo in 1962, son of Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche), since he was born in Bodhgaya India, can be recognised as the official second incarnation of Ju Mipham.

Malcolm wrote:

No, because Bodhgaya is part of an impure realm.

What Mipham was saying in fact that as a Dzogchen practitioner he was going to take rebirth in the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels, but not here, on this planet or in this world system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need to work with plants more.

The Seeker said:

Now I remember why I don't ask questions here.

I grow many plants, year round in NE North America. Under lights and in hydroponic systems. Guess I should work with them more.....

Kindsst wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

Then I am suprised that you don't relate to plants in terms of their ability to sense their environment and respond to it -- that after all is all a feeling is. Things that are painful we avoid; things that are pleasurable we seek out. Plants behave in the same way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 3:04 AM

Title: The Value of Culture

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Kirt asks:

I'm still asking what if anything beyond science, mathematics and engineering needs to be preserved in western culture. Is there a there there? Sally and username are discussing Marx from the starting point of Marx's criticism of capitalism.

Cultures arose historically mostly from little groups with mutual language comprehensibility or religious cohesion interacting. This is all embeded in a samsaric

context and Tibetan culture is no different at least on the secular level.

Why do we need to preserve cultures? The majority of cultures that have ever existed on the planet are gone as distinct, labelable entities. Cultures are identities that people attach to. Do cultures serve any real purpose for humans?

We need to preserve humans cultures in the same way we need to preserve biodiversity in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

This is where the absolute and relative truths are found.

Malcolm wrote:

Which have nothing to do with Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 4th, 2012 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Andrew was arrested in connection with Bill Cassidy and then released when it was ascertained he and Cassidy were not the same person nor acting in concert.

mujushinkyō said:

Please note that I was not arrested. Although I know the cultists are saying loudly that I was.

My house was raided in a pre-dawn tactical operation to seize and search my computers.

Malcolm wrote:

Apologies -- your computers were arrested and held for a year without being charged.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhism and culture

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just an observation, but this thread seems to have seriously veered off course, but since it was a thread created out of another thread, may be this is normal...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

I am a US Army veteran.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have healthcare.

kirtu said:

No - most veterans who served in the late/final Cold War period do not have veteran's benefits (more correctly they don't have war era veteran's benefits) 1975/77 - 1991/2. I served in the middle of that period. I don't have healthcare benefits. I can't even claim the 5 pt federal preference on federal job applications (or couldn't while I was working in the federal government as a civilian - some generals and admirals have spoken out about this issue over the past 18 yrs).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I see, well it seems likely that the Supreme Court will toss out Obama/Romney care, and then they will have a chance to do it right with Single Payer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

The Seeker said:

Hey Malcom, could you please explain this.
other than possibly predatory plants, Venus fly trap for example, I haven't observed anything I'd consider feeling.

Kindest Wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

You need to work with plants more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

kirtu said:

So you are also harassing people.

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, the FBI knocked down the door to his house, locked and loaded, looking for cyber terrorists. I think you would be venting a bit if it happened to you. This is Andrew's party...you would cry to if it happened to you...

kirtu said:

If this actually happened then this needs to be taken to the national press for an investigation of how the FBI can be manipulated and used as a tool against other people. That is very dangerous and imperils the republic.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a matter of public record, it was published in the national media for crying out loud.

kirtu said:

The talk about "Nyingma taliban" ect., death threats without evidence is simply incendiary. If there were death threats, etc. then this needs to be taken to a prosecutor.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say they issued a death warrant, I said they issued a fatwa:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fatw> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;ā

kirtu said:

However as you said Malcolm, the best thing to do on a personal level is simply to ignore the people. However the possible manipulation of the FBI and possible death threats have to be handled legally.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Andrew was arrested in connection with Bill Cassidy and then released when it was ascertained he and Cassidy were not the same person nor acting in concert.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

So you're saying that if I make fun of tulkus I should expect someone to frame me up with the FBI and try to get me killed?

Malcolm wrote:

Around the world, in every religion, people are moving in a more fundamentalist direction. Yes, also in Buddhism. So, since you were perceived to be a threat by a minor league self-appointed Nyingma Taliban, they issued a fatwa against you which is apparently still in force. Rather than admit they made have been mistaken, they have no choice but to continue to harass you. So now you are the subject of a holy jihad. This is characteristic of the religious mentality. It is not a characteristic of the yogic or spiritual mentality. And converts to a religion, you will recall, are usually far more zealous in the prosecution of their new faith (embarrassingly so) than people raised in it. Honestly, the only way to win is to not play (classic game theory). Twitter is a such a stupid service anyway.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Do Theravadins have anything similar to Dzogchen?

Content:

catlady2112 said:

I am curious if the Theravadin tradition has anything equivalent to dzogchen view/practices? Is there even a translation of the word "Dzogchen" into pali (via sanskrit)? Thx!

Malcolm wrote:

No and no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, look closely. Greg: all three accounts specify that Mipham will not be reborn in Tibet. He said to Khenpo Kunphel:

I shall not take rebirth in Tibet. In twenty years, seek me in the northern lands of distant Uttarakuru, and elsewhere, east, west, north and south. Fear not, we shall be re-united again, as father and son. Now go!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

I did write that "obese tulkus make better lovers" tweet. I really do enjoy satire and the absurd, and once it struck me that the people in question weren't going to let me alone no matter what, I indulged this enjoyment fully. I maintain that I have a right to satirize tulkus on my own Twitter page.

I'd like to publish a little book of "tulku tweets" -- not just by me but by a dozen other people at least -- because many of them are really funny, and cumulatively they seem to gain something, even becoming hilarious.

heart said:

If you provoke people you should not be surprised when they get provoked, it is just ordinary cause and effect. Even if you don't consider yourself a Buddhist you should be careful with your actions. I think your expression "tulku tweets" show that your intention isn't the best.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, the FBI knocked down the door to his house, locked and loaded, looking for cyber terrorists. I think you would be venting a bit if it happened to you. This is Andrew's party...you would cry to if it happened to you...

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

The US could still live up to it's promise, become a democracy and help lead humanity to a bright future.

But the way it's going now, the US is on track to create the Ferengi Alliance, although as Quark pointed out in StarTrek DS9 humans are already much worse than Ferengi.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Ferengi Alliance is the WTO, IMF, and the World Bank.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

I am a US Army veteran.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have healthcare.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Mariusz said:

In my humble POV, the best is to do what one's own master of Dzogchen point-out, not necessary Namkhai Norbu...

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, and no one said otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

The Seeker said:

These actions require an actual brain and nervous system to carry out these functions, primarily feeling.

Malcolm wrote:

Plants certainly exhibit the characteristic of feeling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 11:31 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

What's more, some of the things they're saying about me are quite serious. I see nothing wrong with appealing to other Buddhists, sane Buddhists, for help.

Malcolm wrote:

You may have noticed a remarkable importance on the part of the Tibetan ecclesiastical hierarchy to deal with problems of their own creation, whether eastern or western.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The standard Buddhist view is that there are sentient beings who lack form. This is not accepted in Dzogchen teachings.

gregkavarnos said:

Is this because consciousness is based on the element of wind/air in Dzogchen theory?

Malcolm wrote:

As we have seen, for Dzogchen it is because the differentiation between mind and vāyu is merely nominal (different names for the same thing in a body), and thus, all sentient beings must have a physical body, even if it is very subtle, including formless realm beings. Vāyu of course is the name of the air element, and means that. Vāyu, air (Tibetan: rlung) is given the name "prāṇa" (Tibetan: srog) solely because it gives life. Furthermore, each of the five elements contains the potentiality of the other four elements within it.

Plants also use prāṇavāyu...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhism and culture

Content:

username said:

So let's appreciate what we have inherited as civil rights and democracy which is not guaranteed to last forever.

Malcolm wrote:

Amen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Yep, 9 PM EDT.

Although I think it got changed to a closed webcast as of yesterday, as I had to login onto the Shang Shung webcast video page when entered the website.

Virgo said:

Thanks Lhug-Pa. Guess I'll find out at nine. If it's closed I probably won't be able to get in.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

its open, you just have click on audio or video

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The quotes give two accounts: one of Ju Mipham saying he will not reincarnate and one saying that he will reincarnate, but not in Tibet. Both accounts were oral directives given to his attendants.

Malcolm wrote:

Three accounts, Greg: two to students, one publically. So two out of three.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[

You have to realize that Kirt is basically a Monarchist.

M

Virgo said:

Really? I am surprised

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he buys into the idea of enlightened rulers. Of course at the end of the day that is just Plato's Republic redux, the original fascist nightmare.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Eternalism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Again, Madhyamaka revisionism.

gregkavarnos said:

Well, excuse me if I prefer Madhyamaka revisionism to an attempt to introduce the atman into Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

I am merely pointing out that what Madhyamakas say about Tathagatagarbha theory does not necessarily represent the intent of the texts in question themselves. This is why Dolbupa vehemently refuted such Madhyamaka reads of the Tgarbha theory. +

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Eternalism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The True Self alluded to in the Mahaparinirvana Sutra is merely the realisation of the dependently arisen nature of one's existence, the True Self is merely a realisation of the illusory quality of the conventional self. That is the explanation I have heard from a lecture series on the Wheel of Sharp Weapons by Berzin. It's got NOTHING to do with the idea of an atman.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, Madhyamaka revisionism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Will said:

Malcolm: All that is necessary after having received Dzogchen direct introduction (from ChNN) is Guru Yoga.

Must one be in the physical presence, with few people around, for this introduction to be experienced?

Is every transmission from the Guru to disciple X always received loud and clear?

Or is only one transmission, fully experienced, needed?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen language is fairly straight forward and simple, the examples clear, the implications however can take some time to sink in. Many people or few people makes no difference, as long you as are interested, participate as fully as you can and do not expect that direct introduction is a passive experience.

One direct transmission, followed by diligence in application of practice is all you need. Of course some people become transmission junkies searching for something they don't know they are "holding in their hands".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 3rd, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

In the natural state they are complete, but that don't help you much when your not in the natural state.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the principle of Dzogchen that you need to gather something you do not have. It is the principle of Dzogchen to recognize what you already possess.

Relatively speaking, merit ensures rebirth in higher realms, and that is it.

M

heart said:

You think merit has an intention? That sounds like God to me. Merit becomes whatever we dedicate it to, that is why we dedicate it to the full enlightenment of all sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Merit is intention, it does not have intention.

The effect of merit is to ensure rebirth in higher realms. It eventually got conflated with the pre-Buddhist notion of the major and minor marks of a mahāpurusha, which in turn became the major and minor marks of the physical body of a nirmanakāya.

heart said:

Long life, happiness, a great Guru that gives you the direct introduction and the possibility to and capacity as well as the will to practice the instructions until full realization, that is merit. If you have to work all day, have no money, never see your Guru, as many of us live. This is certainly a lack of merit.

You can certainly practice anyway but it is a lot more difficult. Merit can't make us recognize the natural state but it certainly helps a lot.

Malcolm wrote:

Merit, being conditioned and relative, can certainly assist our relative and conditioned state, but that is all. In dzogchen, the rūpakāya is not considered a result of merit, instead it is also an expression of thugs rje.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Both stages are necessary after the pointing out no matter what lineage you practice.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not so. All that is necessary after having received Dzogchen direct introduction (from ChNN) is Guru Yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Hi Malcolm - what has ChNN said about the two accumulations and Dzogchen? I'm wondering particularly about accumulation of merit. As you know there are contrived practices within Tibetan Buddhism for the accumulations. How does this work in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, as I understand it, the two accumulations have always been complete.

M

heart said:

In the natural state they are complete, but that don't help you much when your not in the natural state.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the principle of Dzogchen that you need to gather something you do not have. It is the principle of Dzogchen to recognize what you already possess.

Relatively speaking, merit ensures rebirth in higher realms, and that is it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

The primary impulse of the west is to control other people and restrict their creativity through serfdom. Marx was essentially correct on this point.

Kirt

Anders said:

I have never met or heard of anyone with an impulse to such a thing. Nor do I believe there is a conspiracy to effect this.

It may be an unintentional consequence of western society, but I don't believe it is the driving impulse.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to realize that Kirt is basically a Monarchist.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Are you suggesting our conditions are only formed by our opinions?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I am suggesting that people have a right to assess their own experience without being gainsayed by others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 2nd, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

JKhedrup said:

So I think that while the teachings are presented in this sort of containerless form, ChNN does see tremendous value in traditions as preserved in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, and those of other cultures as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Mariusz said:

Excuse me for curiosity. Can I have the answers about the webcast please? When we hear Rinpoche, it is only electronic sound but not his voice and when we see Rinpoche, it is only the pixels but not his body. If we do not have the connection what we are seeing and what we are hearing, how the transmission really works?

Lhug-Pa said:

Because it is that we're in the same moment with Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche when he intends to give the transmission(s); so since we are in the same moment with his intention, distance is not an issue at all.

Mariusz said:

Has Rinpoche in the past webcasts done a Direct Introduction to Rigpa ever?

Lhug-Pa said:

Yes.

The first few pages of this thread, and at least three other threads as well, have some in-depth discussions regarding this.

Mariusz said:

Sorry, I will read them if I have more time. But can I quickly question: Has Rinpoche ever said it is better to have the direct oral transmission (tib. lung) by him than by internet only? What about DI, is better to meet him at least one time in order to take directly DI from Him, or the same will be if one has never met him and only takes DI from internet?

Malcolm wrote:

CHNN has many times made the statement that receiving transmission and direct introduction from him via webcast is no different than being there in person.

The only exception to this rule is that he will not attempt to do elaborate anuyoga style empowerments via webcast -- for those you must be present. He does frequently give don dbangs, or meaning empowerments via webcast however. He considers the latter more essential and more profound.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Was this sufficient transmission to engage in the Guru Dragphur practice per se...?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well....okay. But it is possible that it did, in fact, make a difference, though he has no "conscious experience" of the difference, is it not?

In other words, one often does not know one's Karma, and it is possible that accumulation of merit occurred, creating seeds, etc., etc., without one being "aware" of it. Do you disagree?

"Recognition" is a wonderful thing, I grant you, and sustaining it is also a wonderful thing, but I think we can all agree that there are causes and conditions that lead to recognition, and often those causes and conditions are not "consciously recognized."

Yes?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know why we have to spend so much time second guessing people's experience. If he said it didn't help, it didn't. If Magnus said it helped him, then it did. You feel me?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

Which other texts?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāparinirvana sūtra for one.

kirtu said:

Dang, I fell into your trap. I have to actually sit down and read that sutra through but you are referring to Chapter 12 where the Tathagatagarbha is identified as the self, etc.? Of course sutra's are finger's pointing to the moon, not the moon itself. It is of course true that the Tathagatagarbha is the self as all beings are endowed with the potential to attain Buddhahood. However that Tathagatagarbha is not self-existent and fully developed (unless we want to suggest that a person's occasional good deed and spontaneous compassion is a sign of the Tathagatagarbha lurking beneath the conditioned surface). We could go round and round (and you have in various explanations over the years and forums). And I could hardly raise a real objection to your arguments.

Nonetheless I would suggest that at least two of the three men's views that were raised a few posts ago, and possibly all three, would almost certainly admit a stronger degree of eternalism than that possibly raised in the Mahāparinirvana Sūtra.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Your statement about the Tathagatagabha sutras is the polished and revisionist

Madhyamaka/Yogacara version of Tgarbha theory. I personally beleive they are every bit as eternalistic in intent as their critics thought them to be. Unlike Madhyamaka [PP sutras] and Yogacara [yogacara sutras] there are no surviving independent treatises which do not belong to either of the aforementioned schools on Tgarbha theory. Tgarbha theory too is arguably much earlier than Yogacara. And the gzhan stong of Dolbuba is fully as eternlist as he is accused of being. Just saying...

M

But this is

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Simon E. said:

I did the full Kagyu Ngondro.

It made no difference one way or another to the transmission of Dzogchen ..

heart said:

I did to, how do you know it didn't make no different?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Because he said so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

Which other texts?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāparinirvana sūtra for one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

All in all Malcolm i do respect your better visions and they are great and inside Dzochén understandable, but we must bear in mind that others can have problems with your very fast methods of taking conclusions. I guess if this was done within a year then it was better with understanding your changing etc., but it went so fast from one person we knew Namdrol to Malcolm. And all within here aboard 3 weeks?

Really believe me it is all very overwhelming, not expected etc. and then this 180 degree contra that what you mostly did believe before.

All very fast, so it does need a certain time to let sink all (new informations / corrections etc. , then many can see better through.

Malcolm wrote:

Understandable.

However, in Dzogchen we do have the metaphor of the Garuda, who develops his ability to fly while still in the egg. Of course, this metaphor really refers to the practitioner who seems ordinary in life, when "the shell of the body" is broken, emerges with all qualities complete in the bardo. Not really making that claim -- but what I am saying is that in most people their personal evolution is not something they usually wear on their sleeve.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

So that's what I base my assertion on. While I haven't spoken to them personally I have nonetheless heard and read their words.

Malcolm wrote:

Uh huh. Buddha also taught eternalism for some folks.

kirtu said:

Yes, that's true. But that was also upaya in order to get them to not fall into nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:

That's what some texts say. And there are other texts that say the opposite.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

So that's what I base my assertion on. While I haven't spoken to them personally I have nonetheless heard and read their words.

Malcolm wrote:

Uh huh. Buddha also taught eternalism for some folks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

Of course esp. in our dark world one can learn lovingkindness and compassion and service from these great people. But they are not teaching a realization of anatta (except possibly in the gross sense of the breakdown or dissolution of artificial ego barriers).

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

How do you know? Did you ever talk to them about whether they accept a personal self?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

If Namdrol would be in Nyingma or Bon, then he would have obtained there Dzogchen earlier and he would be satisfied with that and his Buddhist knowledge, if i may assume that. But Malcolm did reached that insight about Dzogchen after a tough study from many years. How many years when i may ask? And Malcolm doesn' t regret it all at the moment, i hope so. I mean so many years to reach Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Kalsang:

I took refuge in May, 1989 with HH Sakya Trizin.

My first direct encounter with Dzogchen teachings was in 1990 when I attended a lecture on Rushan from Tri Yeshe Lama -- I didn't understand anything.

Then in 1992 I received the Guuhyagarbha empowerment from Bakha Tulku and the explanation of the Rongzom's commentary on that tantra from him. I met Chogyal Namkhai Norbu in that year too and attended a retreat with him that year and in 1993 (klong sde). I also met Khenpo Jigphun in 1993 and received from him his complete Manjushri Dzogchen cycle, the Khandro Nyingthig wang, and the transmission for the Chetsun Nyingthig. I practiced the latter for some time while in my three year retreat.

When I got out of my three retreat I more or less gave up all formal sadhana practice apart from Tregchö for some years apart from receiving the Nyingma Kama transmissions from Penor Rinpoche in 1998 and the explanation of the Buddha in the Palm of Your Hand Ngondro cycle.

In 2001 I met Taklung Tsetrul Rinoche and received his permission to read and translate the five volumes of the Gongpa Zangthal teachings. I also met Kunzang Dechen Lingpa in that year.

In 2002, I met Chogyal Namkhai Norbu again.

At the end of 2002 I received the Nyingthig Yazhi from KDL, and continued to receive many teachings from him in 2004 and 2005 including most of his termas and complete tregchö and thögal from him.

In 2006, 2007, and 2008, I received more instructions on Man ngag sde from Kunzang Dechen's Lingpa's son, Ridzin Dorje.

During this time I was also receiving regular teachings from ChNN, as well as studying to become a doctor of Tibetan Medicine (2005-2009).

It is funny, people often think I am a Sakya, but in fact I have received more Dzogchen teachings than I have received sadhana instruction, or sutrayāna instruction apart from my early days with the Sakaya school and my three year retreat in Sakya. The main Sakya teachings I have received are Tsembupa Chenrezi cycle, Lamdre Tsogshad, and the Vajrayogini Lobshad cycles, and that's it. I have received far more Nyingma teachings than Sakya ones, so it is a little bizzare when people call me a Sakyapa. Of course, I have a title from Sakya, i.e. Acarya based on mostly on my mastery of Tibetan, three year retreat and early course work, Abhidharma and so on and the fact that I have helped Lama Migmar Tseten over the years in many ways. But I am no Geshe, and I am not nearly as well educated as some people assume I am. What I am is an aggressive reader.

So, in fact, when you add it all together, I have received more Dzogchen teachings than any other kind of teaching, and that history goes back for more than 20 years. Not only that, but I had dreams about ChNN in 1987-8, before I ever took refuge.

When I decided I was a Buddhist, it was because I was standing in the rain listening to a group of Japanese woman recite the heart sutra on Hiezan near Kyoto in the summer of

1986. Up to that point I was a musician (fiddle, guitar, bass, early electronica).

So, just so you understand I have been devoting myself to Dzogchen practice for 20 years now self-consciously. Of course, there have been over the years a lot of turmoil in my understanding because my early three years in Sakya and my former drive for orthodox understanding caused inner conflict. However, in the end my love of the Dzogchen teachings and personal value of them for me won out. I happen to be good at tenet systems and have a good memory so it used to fun to debate in a polemical way.

But now I find it heart wrenching and very wrong headed. We live in a world where the five poisons fill not just our minds, but where they are expressed in our very environment, in the way the five elements are in conflict with one another. But of course there is also beauty too, for as I sit writing this, the lovely scent of our Kazanalik roses waft in through my library window.

We cannot do anything about the cycle of living and dying, the fact that we are all food for each other, but we can, through tolerance, natural compassion, and mutual recognition of each other's humanity transcend these divisions that so alienate us from each other, that cause us to split in religion, sect, and tribe and conduct war with other, denying one another our basic humanity through objectifying those who do not understand what we think we understand as "other".

There are no others. All beings are our reflection; through all beings we find ourselves, and see our own faces. And when we meet a master, or two, or three, or more, we have a chance to see our real face. Having seen that real face, how can we deny that to others. Our real face is not white, black, red, yellow. It is not Buddhist, non-Buddhist, or something in between. When we have seen our own real face, then we will see the real face of all others and all of these petty differences just melt.

Please don't think I have had some sudden epiphany -- these thoughts I am expressing have come about through a long process of tempering, heated through hearing, sharpened through meditation and polished through prajñā-- but in the forging of a practitioner is nothing that ever reaches completion until total realization.

In the Samurai tradition, there is a concept of the life-giving sword -- I would like to think of Dharma the same way. When Buddhadhama is wielded polemically, to enforce a view, or a position, or a policy, or a political stance, it too can be just as destructive as a sword wrongly wielded. And in this I am as guilty as any petty sectarian scholar, since I have been petty sectarian scholar for many years. The sword of Dharma should never be drawn lightly. The sword of Dharma should only be drawn to preserve life, to draw people together, who see its highly polished glint and look at it with awe rather than fear. When the sword of Dharma is unsheathed, the scent of attar of rose should fill the air, not blood.

So you see, for me, I have no interest anymore in sectarian buddhism that characterizes so much of "buddhist discourse" over the centuries. The siddha movement in late medieval India was non-sectarian -- it produced two main heirs, the Vajrayāna tradition

of Tibet and the Natha Sampradaya, as well as other offshoots. "Non-Buddhist" bards call the Bauls in Bengal still sing the Dohas contained in the Caryagiti. Some people think Vajrayāna disappeared into India. Nothing could be further from the truth. India and its outlying regions such as Oḍḍiyāna have been the garden for the many spiritual movements. They sprout, they flourish, they fruit, they are harvested, and in the end they are ploughed back into the soil to provide nourishment for future spiritual movements. Occasionally, strains escaped from India, and flourished in Isolation. Dzogchen is just one such movement. Mahāyāna another.

I have spent the last 20 years devoting almost my whole life to Buddhist texts, and in particular Dzogchen texts. Everything I have studied or read was somehow related to my practice, even my working stuff out as a sectarian jerk (which people still accuse me of) was related somehow to my practice. I have come to the point in my understanding where I clearly see that all these sectarian divisions of this religion and that religion are negative. Not in the sense that we should not all pursue a spiritual path that is pleasing to us (right now mine is smelling roses, listening to music and typing this post), but in the sense we should be kind and generous about others spiritual paths. Dont get me wrong, I am not saying put on rose-colored spectacles and ignore for example that in the past there have been grave injustices met out to many peoples in the name of religion, the misdeeds of institutional religion in all its forms. We can recognize these and then move on.

Humanity needs to move into post-religious, post-tribal phase where we meet each other with respect and decency. I am trying my best to meet all of you here on Dwheel from that point of view, and I also fail, will fail, have failed, and for that I am sorry. But my deepest wish is that we can all just get past all divisive nonsense and focus on what is truly important. It's a process, and no one gets it right the first time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

...but this is not the same understanding and realization as Buddhdharma.

Malcolm wrote:

When you have realized Buddhadharma, then you can say something about the "realization of Buddhadharma". As for understanding, there are a hundred different understandings of Buddhadharma, and some are quite "eternalistic". In the meantime, it is better to keep an open mind and not create more unnecessary divisions in an already fractured world.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 1st, 2012 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Why everybody keeps calling it a Buddhist community is well beyond me! I mean the "secular" newspapers who have no idea, I can understand, but now even Tricycle? Mind you, from what I hear about Tricycle... Sigh...

Knotty Veneer said:

I know what you mean. I just got spammed by Tricycle for a "BuddhaFest Online Film Festival" which included a film about Ram Das and video of a performance by Krishna Das. Now I am sure the latter two gentlemen are wonderful people but neither is Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, both Ram Das and Krishna Das are students of Tulku Orgyen. Many of Neem Karoli Baba's students wound up sitting at the feet of Tulku Orgyen and many are still involved with Gomde crowd, Danny Goleman, etc.

But your comments are just more proof of what a confining and narrow box the label "Buddhist" has come to be. The first place I ever encountered Guru Rinpoche and his mantra was in Be Here Now.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhasa said:

If someone had said it involves yoga positions and you need to be physically fit to do them, :

Malcolm wrote:

These postions do not require you to be physically fit. Longde was originally transmitted to an 80 year old guy who had to rest his chin on a stick.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

alpha said:

i am trying to understand the connection between Donwang of Heruka Ngondzog Gyalpo, longde and the Guru Yoga with AUM.

My understanding is that whenever one does a session of longde practice one has to do the Guru Yoga with AUM to connect with the transmission of this particular practice of longde .

Is this correct?

Another question i have is related to The Donwang itself.

For me personally this donwang was particularly powerful.

Is there any point in repeating it as a way of Guru yoga or as a way of re-actualizing the transmission?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

As to question one, yes.

As to two, no.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 11:48 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Quite a few, if not most of the arguments used by vegetarians to illustrate why not eating meat is a wise choice are valid. It may be better for your health, better for the environment, and will separate one slightly from the slaughterhouse industry.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what kind of meat. Industrial agriculture produces inferior food, whether plant or animal, organic or conventional, since it is based on petro-chemicals is not nourishing. Eat local, eat in season, eat a wide variety of things. Then you will be healthy.

The bulk of food ideologies are hoaxes. And yes, it is inevitable that for some beings to live, other beings must die.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 11:04 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Virgo said:

Maybe you ought to realize that it is the nature of man to use force. You seem to wish to deny this fact and ignore it. However, you would have the law makers force all people in the land to not eat meat at all, and have the enforcers of the law armed to the teeth to enforce such. Who's the one that's confused now?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Forget it Kev -- this guy is into the food police all the while complaining about "violence". Vegan fascism, basically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

That is also not an argument.

Earlier in this thread when you tried to produce what you thought were good arguments or facts for meat consumption you mentioned about hypothetical ideal grass feed livestock operations even specifically mentioning the infamous Polyface farm of Joel Salatin. I dealt with that here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=213&p=99443&hilit=polyface+farm#p99443> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

and here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=213&p=99470&hilit=vegetarian+myth#p99470> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Counting the surrounding forest so vital to that operation you can only feed a very meager 2 people per 10 acres. That kind of meat is also very expensive for consumers, and like all other meat it is also costly for the environment and the health-care system.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea it their method of animal husbandry is costly for the enviroment is total nonsense. You obviously have not read a single thing written by Salatan.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 10:04 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

Obviously veganism promotes less violence and not more, if it didn't you could figure out an actual argument instead of innuendo.

Malcolm wrote:

What nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 9:13 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

Now that is for people, for animals, especially livestock, they live with much more restrictions, with almost no choice possible and much more violence used against them to suit taste preferences which demand cheap meat. What people like you don't want to realize is that your way of life is predicated on a huge amount of violence, coercion, techniques of manipulation. For the developed world to live their relatively lavish lifestyle, they victimize most the rest of the globe. It is not a way of life you have a right to live, it is maintained by force, by the American military, its allies, by coercive institutions like the IMF, the World bank, etc.

So people are ok with force, what they are not ok is having to do with less than they are accustomed to, that is the root of the issue. If you are an adult and you don't already realize such things it is because you don't want to know.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh I see, Veganism is the solution to the world woes? Give me a break.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Blue Garuda"]

My point was that on the basis of that assertion it is not logical to claim that all things with form are therefore sentient.

[/quite]

I never made that inference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

when computers communicate with each other over a network, does that mean they are sentient?

Malcolm wrote:

The internet is not a self-organizing system, it's a limited extension of our neurology.

gad rgyangs said:

if computers are connected to a network, to robots who can build computers, and run software that evaluates its own architecture, modifies designs, and uses the robots to build new computers and robots that further evolve and change, is it sentient?

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps machines can evolve into sentience. But at this point I don't think we can consider consider machines self-organizing at the level of complexity we see with biological life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Let's not confuse form with sentience. Apparently not all sentient beings have form and not all forms are sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

All sentient beings have form.

M

Blue Garuda said:

Hmmm: 'Swans are white therefore all white things are swans' kinda logic here?

All things which have form are not necessarily 'beings' or 'sentient' - we just attach those labels.

Malcolm wrote:

The standard Buddhist view is that there are sentient beings who lack form. This is not accepted in Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Fa Dao said:

WOW!! this has been going on now for quite some time. Some people are really getting fired up. Not my place to take a side or say who is right or wrong. But at some point dont we all have to ask ourselves "is all of this bickering really helping anyone?" (and it truly has turned into bickering) Maybe its time to bury the hatchet and just move on to more productive discussions? Just a thought.....

Silent Bob said:

Well, Mr. Smarty-Pants, you are wrong once again! This is not bickering, not at all, though it may appear that way to the unlettered. It will be recognized in years to come as the First Internet Council of the Wise, where the future direction of Buddhadharma was decided and the tulku system abolished.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh hell bob, now you've gone and spoilt everthang. Iffen we cain't bicker, what else is we gonna do in our dilbert cubes???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Let's not confuse form with sentience. Apparently not all sentient beings have form and not all forms are sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

All sentient beings have form.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

misrepresenting what I said.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not misrepresented a single thing you have said. The reverse, sadly, is not true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

You have completely lost your critical reasoning, rationalism and any sense of balance.

Malcolm wrote:

You brought up Mao not me.

username said:

My point was that it is part Buddhist tradition. Just that.

Malcolm wrote:

What you said was that refuge was a Buddhist tradition. I pointed out that not only Buddhism has a tradition of refuge.

username said:

Like when Mariusz asked if a believer of other traditions denying emptiness can receive the whole of Dzogchen transmissions and go through the four visions while holding on to those contradictory beliefs. You said he can receive all of Dzogchen Transmissions.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, he can.

username said:

You have been debating people in the thread when they talked of bodhicitta methods in their traditions. I said they are necessary specially if someone mistakenly thinks he has realized his nature as well as Rushens Semzins etc. There is a restricted booklet on this by ChNNR that I have from Dzogchen POV. They are necessary after that initial stage too. The rest of your post above again is nothing to do with what I said, like Ganesh on youtube etc.. Finally you are engaging in sophistry again as bodicitta is included in the nine yanas of buddhism as I said "Buddhist relative bodhicitta methods" quote you attack. That Buddhist path for most Dzogchenpas includes Ati yoga. So again my definition is valid and the mistake is yours. QED.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said anywhere that bodhicitta was unnecessary. What I did say that gradual cultivation of contrived compassion and so on is unnecessary.

You should really not jump to conclusions.

We all know the three sublime things you have for a perfect practice: refuge, knowledge of our real condition (bodhicitta), and dedication.

Now, I would expect about now you are a little bored with this, cause I sure am. Between your persistent misrepresentations of what I have actually said, and Dronma's persistent accusations that I am leading a Jihad (really????!!???, what silliness) it is all a bit much.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Yes but not everyone you learn some facts from as is claimed here in error. You could watch a film clip of Hitler or Mao or George W. Bush and learn a few statistics or facts you might not know but then you can't stick them up there in the tree and take refuge which BTW is Buddhist. So you have to weed out some and not include all as Malcolm claims.

Malcolm wrote:

When I first heard this teaching from ChNN in 1992, he said all your teachers, anyone from whom you have learned anything -- he included grade school teachers and so on.

The concept of going for refuge (sharanam) is not strictly Buddhist. Also Hindus go for refuge:

<https://youtu.be/4jXAMZtnxn0> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

username said:

1- Well tell the Dalai Lama who had to endure lectures and facts and figures on a few occasions from Mao who killed tens of millions of Chinese by war and famine that he needs to take refuge in Mao too as part of his refuge tree. As before you misunderstand ChNNR.

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL considers himself a Marxist, and he learned his Marxism from Mao.

NDTV: Do you still think of yourself as a Marxist ?

The Dalai Lama: Yes . As far as social economic theory is concerned I am a Marxist.

<http://dalailama.com/messages/transcripts/barkha-dutt-interview-ndtv> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

2- Irrelevant, my point was that refuge tree is part of Tibetan Buddhist Vajrayana founded by Padmasambhava whose inner most essence teaching and intent is Dzogchen.

You mean refuge tree visualizations did not exist in India?

username said:

Excluding relative Bodhicitta from Dzogchen path in the name of sectarianism is yet another lack of realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Who excluded relative bodhicitta from the Dzogchen path -- not me? You said:

username said:

The best way to cultivate it is by buddhist relative bodhicitta methods.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a standard sectarian Buddhist view. Oh well.

I did not exclude anything.

I just pointed out once again your limiting language. Relative bodhicitta, for example, is only "buddhist" according to you. I guess a lot of bodhisattvas who have never heard of Buddhism are screwed since they do not know about your relative bodhicitta, having never heard of it. Frankly, I know many non-buddhists who have much better bodhicitta than a lot of the so called mahāyāna buddhists I know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But if you look at my siganture, you will see that it is not that way in Dzogchen.

Virgo said:

I understand.

Kevin

tomamundsen said:

Hi Malcolm. Could you please explain your signature? I don't understand it...

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

It means that plants are part of the display of Samanabhadra, just like everything else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Have you ever caught a fish? They certainly do feel pain.

Virgo said:

I don't really like fishing it was never my thing.

And yeah I was just joking. Fish certainly do feel pain.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

I did not understand the jk.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

when computers communicate with each other over a network, does that mean they are sentient?

Malcolm wrote:

The internet is not a self-organizing system, it's a limited extension of our neurology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

greentreeee said:

wow, Hitler and Jihad?

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Godwin%27s_law "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;:"

It states: "As an online discussion grows longer, the probability of a comparison involving Nazis or Hitler approaches 1." [2] [3] In other words, Godwin observed that, given enough time, in any online discussion—regardless of topic or scope—someone inevitably makes some comparison to Hitler and the Nazis.

And:

There are many corollaries to Godwin's law, some considered more canonical (by being adopted by Godwin himself) [3] than others. [1] For example, there is a tradition in many newsgroups and other Internet discussion forums that once such a comparison is made, the thread is finished and whoever mentioned the Nazis has automatically lost whatever debate was in progress. [8] This principle is itself frequently referred to as Godwin's law. It is considered poor form to raise such a comparison arbitrarily with the motive of ending the thread. There is a widely recognized corollary that any such ulterior-motive invocation of Godwin's law will be unsuccessful. [9]

And:

Some have called for Godwin's law to be renamed Beck's law because of the numerous allusions to Nazi Germany by talk show host Glenn Beck. [16] The Washington Post tallied 202 mentions of Nazis or Nazism, according to transcripts, 147 mentions of Hitler, 193 uses of "fascism" or "fascist," and another 24 mentions of Joseph Goebbels, all within 18 months. Media Matters used these facts to assert Godwin's Law is no longer relegated to chat rooms but now applies to cable news and other media outlets. [17]

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Termas discovered outside of Tibet/Nepal

Content:

Josef said:

Didnt KDL reveal mind ter in New York state as well?

Malcolm wrote:

And at my house when I was living in Shelburne Falls, on my front porch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Nemo said:

To say some DNA based life is sentient and some is not sounds implausible. It makes me think of the turn of the century "scientists" who unequivocally said animals like dogs cannot feel pain.

I will treat all life like it is alive.

Malcolm wrote:

Good point:

In the center of every plant cell – from algae to orchids – and in the center of every animal cell – from jellyfish to you and me – there's a copy of the organism's genetic material. This DNA carries a complete blueprint of the organism. It's what transfers characteristics from one generation to the next.

There are pretty obvious differences between plants and animals, but – at the chemical level – the cells of all plants and all animals contain DNA in the same shape – the famous “double helix” that looks like a twisted ladder. What's more, all DNA molecules – in both plants and animals – are made from the same four chemical building blocks – called nucleotides.

What is different is how these four nucleotides in DNA are arranged. It's their sequence that determines which proteins will be made. The way the nucleotides are arranged, and the information they encode, decides whether the organism will produce scales or leaves – legs or a stalk.

Research shows that plants and animals may produce some proteins in common. One prominent example is known as Cytochrome C. But because the DNA copying process is imperfect, mistakes accumulate over time, making Cytochrome C slightly different in different creatures. The gene regions that specify the amino acid sequence in human Cytochrome C are more similar to those in another mammal like a rabbit, and less similar to a more evolutionarily distant creature, like a sunflower.

The schematic of classifying animals and plants in kingdoms is facing competition. More recently an alternative system has arisen, based on evolutionary and molecular information. Cytochrome c is perhaps the canonical or paradigmatic molecule in this approach.

Every species has a characteristic number of chromosomes, called the chromosome number. Animals have more chromosomes; plants have fewer.

<http://earthsky.org/?p=433> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Nemo said:

To say some DNA based life is sentient and some is not sounds implausible. It makes me think of the turn of the century "scientists" who unequivocally said animals like dogs cannot feel pain.

I will treat all life like it is alive.

Virgo said:

Fish don't feel pain, though.

Jk

Malcolm wrote:

Have you ever caught a fish? They certainly do feel pain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Sherlock said:

No one practising Western magic has to my knowledge achieved results as described in the grimoires even when they've followed them very literally (speaking as someone who has actually tried it, I haven't gotten any significant results either). There are no magicians out there who've managed to get demons to appear before them and instantly teach them everything about physics, languages etc or used demons to conjure up armies. There is a lot of magical thinking and lying going on in this field, not saying there isn't in Tibetan Buddhism, but then again Dzogchen isn't Buddhism. The results which Western magicians actually do achieve, you can too by anuyoga practice, and that will probably do more for helping with your experience of vidya at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

Grimoires for the most part were written for Christian priests expert in Christian liturgy. If you don't beleive in the Tetreagrammaton it is very likely that grimoire magic is not going to work for you. For example:

And I say to thee obey, in the name of him who spake and it was; and in every one of ye, O ye names of God! Moreover in the names Adonai, EL., Elohim., Elohi, Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh, Zabaoth, Elion, Iah, Tetragrammaton, Shaddai, Lord God Most High, I stir thee up; and in our strength I say Obey!

If you don't beleive in god, it just ain't going to fly for you. You will lack conviction.

Ok, returning to topic...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, is the human host body "sentient"? The minute you admit that "spirits" inhabit plants, you are opening the door for plants to be considered sentient. Just as the mind leaves the host body, so to would plant spirits leave the their host plants, and take up a new life in a newly germinated plant, for example. This just means that "plants" would be part of the preta realm.

M

Virgo said:

Explained that way it seems more plausible.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for as long as one is still attached the principle of a dichotomy between mind and matter.

But if you look at my signature, you will see that it is not that way in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

PS It seems that the term inhabits (in reference to the Yakshas) is the key to understanding the statement. Like humans inhabit houses but this does not make houses sentient so Yakshas inhabit trees, rocks, and other natural physical phenomena but this does not make the phenomena sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, is the human host body "sentient"? The minute you admit that "spirits" inhabit plants, you are opening the door for plants to be considered sentient. Just as the mind leaves the host body, so to would plant spirits leave the their host plants, and take up a new life in a newly germinated plant, for example. This just means that "plants" would be part of the preta realm.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

If we are to consider plants as sentient then where do they fit into the 6 realms schema? What is the mental "poison" that causes one to be born as a plant? Why did the Buddha not include plants in the schema of realms? Why is there no reference in the bardo teachings on the light, Buddha, wisdom and poison associated with the plant realm?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is I have no idea.

gregkavarnos said:

Do you believe that the concept of "plants as sentients" can be introduced into the teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is extraneous to the teachings.

gregkavarnos said:

How would that benefit practice or help one achieve liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

If plants are conscious communities, and this is demonstrable, then this opens up the door for increased awareness and understanding of our world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 31st, 2012 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Challenge23 said:

My experience matches up with what you are talking about pretty closely. I was told by Rinpoche that in order to learn Dzogchen I would have to do the Ngondro, learn Phowa, Dream Yoga, Tummo, and Shinay, then Striking the Essence in Three Phrases by Garab Dorje and then I would be able to learn Dzogchen. Needless to say I am pretty sure that I won't be able to really buckle down and really learn all that until I retire(I'm soon to be 36 now), if ever.

Malcolm wrote:

None of which was ever required by Garab Dorje.

Dzogchen starts with direct introduction. Once you have received that, you are on a Dzogchen path and you do not need to do all this other stuff first.

Challenge23 said:

Yeah. The ironic part is that if you would have asked me about 15 years ago if I wanted a group of teachings that would eventually allow me to have a solid foundation in Tibetan magic(which from my understanding I would be very close to by the time I got done with all of those prerequisites) I would have been so interested I would have gone into fits of approval. However, at the time I just wanted to learn Dzogchen and get on with my life. Now I'm not sure that all of the time past 20 minutes of meditation 3x a week would be better spent playing World of Warcraft.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you are into magic, just practice Dzogchen and all those results which take years of practice through elaborate rituals can accomplished merely through Dzogchen practice without uttering a single mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Challenge23 said:

My experience matches up with what you are talking about pretty closely. I was told by Rinpoche that in order to learn Dzogchen I would have to do the Ngondro, learn Phowa, Dream Yoga, Tummo, and Shinay, then Striking the Essence in Three Phrases by Garab Dorje and then I would be able to learn Dzogchen. Needless to say I am pretty sure that I won't be able to really buckle down and really learn all that until I retire(I'm soon to be 36 now), if ever.

Malcolm wrote:

None of which was ever required by Garab Dorje.

Dzogchen starts with direct introduction. Once you have received that, you are on a Dzogchen path and you do not need to do all this other stuff first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Huseng said:

This is interesting (from Bhante's blog above):

The ancient Indians believed that trees would give their bounty on condition that they were treated with a degree of respect and the Buddha told a story to illustrate this very point. Long ago, the mythical King Koravya had an amazing banyan tree in his realm which bore fruit of exceptional sweetness. Everyone in the realm enjoyed the fruit freely and so there was no reason to guard the tree. But one day a man ate his fill of the fruit then broke a branch and went away. So angry was the spirit of the tree by this ingratitude

that it caused the tree to bear no more fruit (A.III,369-70).

It seems the idea that trees could be inhabited by "spirits" (I'd be curious what the Pali or Sanskrit would be ... deva?) was widespread.

Malcolm wrote:
Yakṣās.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:30 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Lhug-Pa said:

I was going to say that there has got to be an Eastern counterpart specifically related to the idea of Plant Elementals, but here we have it from the Jataka Tales, Tree Spirits:

Huseng said:
I also recall a Jataka tale about two "tree spirits"...

<http://www.danielharper.org/story22.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
I don't think this is really canonical, let alone widely accepted. The issue of plant sentience is basically just that the Buddha never said, "Plants are not sentient beings." Within the six paths you don't see plants listed anywhere and even in early Buddhism I've never seen mention of "rebirth as a plant". It might be that even in early times people were uncertain about the "sentient status" of plants.

Malcolm wrote:
Schmidhausen has an interesting monograph on the status of plants in Early Buddhism, his take on it is that early Buddhists did regard plants as sentient in some fashion.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:20 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
It makes me realize the truth of this Upanishadic statement:

"All beings, that exist on earth, are born of food; then they live by food, then again to the food they go at the end . so verily food is the eldest of all creatures. Therefore, it is called the medicament of all. All those who worship food as Brahman obtain all food. Food is indeed the eldest of all creatures. Therefore, it is called the medicine for all. From food all beings are born, having been born they grow by food. Food is eaten by the beings and it also eats them. Therefore, it is called food (Anna)."

https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Taittiriya_Upanishad "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Huseng said:

There is a kind of reassuring comfort knowing that despite having consumed and harmed so many beings in this life, when all is said and done my flesh and blood will nourish many other beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhists spend so much time worrying about the "self" that they fail to appreciate the great and profound wisdom to be gleaned from the rishis who composed the Vedas and Upanishads. Consider the Hymn to Herbs:

1. HERBS that sprang up in time of old, three ages earlier than the Gods,—
Of these, whose hue is brown, will I declare the hundred powers and seven.
- 2 Ye, Mothers, have a hundred homes, yea, and a thousand are your growths.
Do ye who have a thousand powers free this my patient from disease.
- 3 Be glad and joyful in the Plants, both blossoming and bearing fruit,
Plants that will lead us to success like mares who conquer in the race.
- 4 Plants, by this name I speak to you, Mothers, to you the Goddesses:
Steed, cow, and garment may I win, win back thy very self, O man.
- 5 The Holy Fig tree is your home, your mansion is the Parna tree:
Winners of cattle shali ye be if ye regain for me this man.
- 6 He who hath store of Herbs at hand like Kings amid a crowd of men,—
Physician is that sage's name, fiend-slayer, chaser of disease.
- 7 Herbs rich in Soma, rich in steeds, in nourishments, in strengthening power,—
All these have I provided here, that this man may be whole again.
- 8 The healing virtues of the Plants stream forth like cattle from the stall,—
Plants that shall win me store of wealth, and save thy vital breath, O man.
- 9 Reliever is your mother's name, and hence Restorers are ye called.
Rivers are ye with wings that fly: keep far whatever brings disease.
- 10 Over all fences have they passed, as steals a thief into the fold.
The Plants have driven from the frame whatever malady was there.
- 11 When, bringing back the vanished strength, I hold these herbs within my hand,
The spirit of disease departs ere he can seize upon the life.
- 12 He through whose frame, O Plants, ye creep member by member, joint by joint,—
From him ye drive away disease like some strong arbiter of strife.
- 13 Fly, Spirit of Disease, begone, with the blue jay and kingfisher.
Fly with the wind's impetuous speed, vanish together with the storm.
- 14 Help every one the other, lend assistance each of you to each,
All of you be accordant, give furtherance to this speech of mine.
- 15 Let fruitful Plants, and fruitless, those that blossom, and the blossomless,
Urged onward by Br̥haspati, release us from our pain and grief;
- 16 Release me from the curse's plague and woe that comes from Varuṇa;
Free me from Yama's fetter, from sin and offence against the Gods.
- 17 What time, descending from the sky, the Plants flew earthward, thus they spake:
No evil shall befall the man whom while he liveth we pervade,

18 Of all the many Plants whose King is, Soma, Plants of hundred forms,
Thou art the Plant most excellent, prompt to the wish, sweet to the heart.
19 O all ye various Herbs whose King is Soma, that o'erspread the earth,
Urged onward by Brhaspati, combine your virtue in this Plant.
20 Unharm'd be he who digs you up, unharm'd the man for whom I dig:
And let no malady attack biped or quadruped of ours.
21 All Plants that hear this speech, and those that have departed far away,
Come all assembled and confer your healing power upon this Herb.
22 With Soma as their Sovran Lord the Plants hold colloquy and say:
O King, we save from death the man whose cure a Brahman undertakes.
23 Most excellent of all art thou, O Plant thy vassals are the trees.
Let him be subject to our power, the man who seeks to injure us.

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/rigveda/rv10097.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I am absolutely mystified why there has been no public calling to account of this organization by the Palyul organization as a whole.

Malcolm wrote:

Because to acknowledge that there is a problem means that someone is responsible for the problem, and in this case it all leads back to Gyaltrul Rinpoche and Penor Rinpoche.

This is the just the standard Tibetan approach, if you pretend that something isn't a problem, it ceases to be one, theoretically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Plant Sentient

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, he isn't.

Huseng said:

I also recall a Jataka tale about two "tree spirits"...

<http://www.danielharper.org/story22.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

It is an interesting matter to consider.

It makes me consider a Jain diet to be honest.

Malcolm wrote:

It makes me realize the truth of these Upanishadic statements:

"All beings, that exist on earth, are born of food; then they live by food, then again to the food they go at the end. So verily food is the eldest of all creatures. Therefore, it is called the medicament of all. All those who worship food as Brahman obtain all food. Food is indeed the eldest of all creatures. Therefore, it is called the medicine for all. From food all beings are born, having been born they grow by food. Food is eaten by the beings and it also eats them. Therefore, it is called food (Anna)."

And:

He perceived that food is Brahman, for from food these beings are produced; by food, when born, they live; and into food they enter at their death.

And:

Let him never abuse food, that is the rule.

Breath is food, the body eats the food. The body rests on breath, breath rests on the body. This is the food resting on food. He who knows this food resting on food, rests exalted, becomes rich in food, and able to eat food (healthy), becomes great by offspring, cattle, and the splendour of his knowledge (of Brahman), great by fame.

Let him never shun food, that is the rule. Water is food, the light eats the food. The light rests on water, water rests on light. This is the food resting on food. He who knows this food resting on food, rests exalted, becomes rich in food, and able to eat food (healthy), becomes great by offspring, cattle, and the splendour of his knowledge (of Brahman), great by fame.

Let him acquire much food, that is the rule. Earth is food, the ether eats the food. The ether rests on the earth, the earth rests on the ether. This is the food resting on food. He who knows this food resting on food, rests exalted, becomes rich in food, and able to eat food (healthy), becomes great by offspring, cattle, and the splendour of his knowledge (of Brahman), great by fame.

'I am food (object), I am food, I am food! I am the eater of food (subject), I am the eater of food, I am the eater of food! I am the poet (who joins the two together), I am the poet, I am the poet! I am the first-born of the Right (rita). Before the Devas I was in the centre of all that is immortal. He who gives me away, he alone preserves me: him who eats food, I eat as food.

https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Taittiriya_Upanishad "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:58 PM
Title: Re: Plant Sentient
Content:
Huseng said:
Beautiful research.

I've often wondered if trees could be self-aware on some level.

I'm aware that the Jains insist that all plants have souls, hence their unique ideas on vegetarianism.

As far as I know the Buddha is not on record declaring that plants could not be sattva.

Malcolm wrote:
No, he isn't.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:31 PM
Title: Plant Sentient
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
<http://www.wakingtimes.com/2012/05/02/how-trees-communicate-video/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:14 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
username said:
Yes but not everyone you learn some facts from as is claimed here in error. You could watch a film clip of Hitler or Mao or George W. Bush and learn a few statistics or facts you might not know but then you can't stick them up there in the tree and take refuge which BTW is Buddhist. So you have to weed out some and not include all as Malcolm claims.

Malcolm wrote:
When I first heard this teaching from ChNN in 1992, he said all your teachers, anyone from whom you have learned anything -- he included grade school teachers and so on.

The concept of going for refuge (sharanam) is not strictly Buddhist. Also Hindus go for refuge:

<https://youtu.be/4jXAMZtnxn0> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Termas discovered outside of Tibet/Nepal

Content:

Sherlock said:

Have there been any termas discovered outside of Tibet/Nepal in recorded history?

Much of Southeast Asia and even the Maldives (and of course even Oddiyana, Gandhara etc) used to practise Vajrayana, and lamas travel around this region all the time, have they uncovered any sidhis here yet? ChNN did receive an initial dream of one of his mind-ters in Singapore but it wasn't really connected to the region from what I've read.

Malcolm wrote:

Not earth treasures, so far as I know.

But the treasures of ChNN are very connected with place -- the Vajradance for example was first revealed at Khandroling just 6 miles from the house I grew up in, in Ashfield, MA, and 7.5 miles away from where I presently live. ChNN will come here to have very specific dreams for new indications for details of his teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Not really. You started this whole thing by saying (gist of) going up a hill by a stream or something how you were struck by the beauty of nature and realized being 50 you suddenly felt full of love for all beings and felt the need to apologize to 3 of the biggest damsi mandalas currently going not to mention saying what you said about opposing the nkt and leaving out others you had attacked/argued with but said you mean them all.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually this all started because I said that you don't need much besides the five elements, etc.

I think when we hurt the feelings of others without need, we should make apologies. It does not matter if we think they are samaya breakers or whatever. That concept of "samaya breakers" only functions in the Buddhist world. This kind of thing is all completely relative. And really, in the long run, if someone breaks their samaya that is their business, and not ours.

username said:

However you soon picked up criticizing TNR who according to many including some of your dead and living gurus was a great siddha. So it was a sudden U-turn in your own words which you deny as gradual. This sort of thing happens to many who are actually quite settled and happy. That is the point.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not criticize TNR, I just said I don't agree with his reasoning about Mt. Meru and so on.

username said:

You have had many shifts of position on Dzogchen. First being an orthodox Sakya. Then saying Dzogchen was the highest. Then before e-sangha's parinirvana you suddenly had another U-turn and said you were wrong and "years of study and sitting on your meditation cushion (realizations?) had led you to believe that in fact Dzogchen was not above other systems and equivalent to the fourth Word empowerment". Then on this forum you had a fourth U-turn saying Dzogchen was the greatest above others in the Buddhist system. Now you are turning left saying you are not a buddhist and Garab Dorje was not a Buddhist and he is who matters to you not Padmasambhava as for Nyingmapas. But your lineage masters would say they got it from Padmasambhava's lineage who said he and Garab were Buddhists!

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't really say I was not a Buddhist, I said, actually that nominally I was a Buddhist meaning that other people will still consider me a Buddhist, but that I don't care about that label anymore, that I am not really feeling it. I find it is just a label that causes separation and limitations. So I don't need it anymore. You are welcome to it.

I never said Padmasambhava does not matter to me, but Garab Dorje is more important.

username said:

You tarred me with the same brush

Malcolm wrote:

I did not tar you with any brush -- I simply disagreed with a statement you made about Gaudapada.

username said:

If you look at most of my postings you will see I was supporting many of your positions and saying I have been at this position all along.

Malcolm wrote:

In the past, yes this is true,
Also as I said this is not the time to start a crusade

No one started a crusade.

username said:

As I said Buddhist is a label but so is Dzogchenpa which you have to concede. Also you quote me saying Buddhism is an illusory upaya, but so is nirvana and the bhumis and as I said the Dzogchen path is also an illusory upaya which you have to accept too. So same same, and better have the realization that peoples' various conditions have to be respected.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree with all of this.

username said:

The best way to cultivate it is by buddhist relative bodhicitta methods.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a standard sectarian Buddhist view. Oh well.

username said:

All the best Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks, and you too.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Malcolm,

You know for me being Buddhist has nothing to do with belief or intellectual ideas. It is a path. Since I received direct introduction from my Guru 20 years ago I have slowly come to the conclusion that the practices I been working so hard at before receiving direct introduction were actually perfectly designed to make you relax in the natural state.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, never said otherwise.

heart said:

So you can say that the direct introduction verified Buddhism as a valid path for me and also as a very perfect path.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, never said otherwise.

heart said:

When I applauded your now removed blogpost on the inability to separate Dzogchen and Buddhism, that you wrote in response to Jim Valby teaching "Dzogchen without Buddhism", it was of course a lack of openness on my part.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not write that as a reponse to Jim Valby, actually. I wrote that as a response to a title of a program. I removed the post temporarily, because I want to write a response to myself. I don't disagree with many things I said in that post, but I want to clarify somethings.

heart said:

You see I never had any other spiritual path or religion than Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Me either.

I wasn't baptized: me either

never took the first communion: me either

never felt interested i anything but old magic and anarchism: me too

heart said:

In general I must say that I know very little about spiritual paths compared with the people on this forum for example. I think that is a good thing I learned from this discussion, that one actually is limited in many ways. For this reason it is probably a bad idea to say that you have to be a Buddhist to attain full enlightenment, I certainly don't know that. But I am afraid I can't give up the label "Buddhist" because it is the path I am standing on, it is the methods I use, and its heart of wisdom is the Dzogchen Tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said anyone had to change anything. That is not the principle of Dzogchen. Buddhists do not have to change being Buddhist, Xtians do not have to change being Xtians, Hindus do not have to change being Hindus, etc. If they are interested enough to practice Dzogchen, all they have to do is receive introduction and apply the practice, but they don't have change a thing.

heart said:

Anyway Malcolm, you certainly know how to put the house on fire, it is your dramatic streak. Sorry if I come of as the small minded and limited person I am. So, in to the lions mouth with you Loppon Kunga Namdrol Malcolm Smith and may you only know happiness and go from clarity to clarity.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

My apparent "changes" sometimes take people by surprise, and as person born in a Tiger year, it is impossible for me to march to anyone else's drummer.

I never mean to be dramatic, but I guess some people take things I say as dramatic.

Anyway, I appreciate your reply.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 11:59 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Virgo said:

What does this discussion have to do with a mid-life crisis at all.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing of course. But because I decided once and for all to depart from the mask I have maintained for years as an orthodox Buddhist polemicist, people are understandably puzzled, critical, or disbelieving.

Once people have fixed you in their minds, if you do not satisfy their criteria of you, they generally become critical. For example, when I originally defended meat-eating on E-Sangha, some people supported that, others did not. When I went through a phase of having personal issues with eating meat, and discussed it, some people supported it, others did not. When I reversed my thinking about it once and for all, some of the people who supported me in my meat-critical phase were understandably puzzled at my reversal of perspective.

Now, some people do not like the fact that as far as I am concerned, "Buddhism" is just another limitation. They do not like the fact that I am not holding some sacred place for Buddhism over against non-Buddhist religions. They think that this is some sudden shift on my part. But had they really been paying attention to my posts over the years they would have noted my gradual evolution away from "Buddhism" per se.

They have not understood my basic point at all:...when you have received direct introduction, and are diligently applying the practice of Dzogchen, it does not matter at all what you believe while you are not practicing, it does not matter what your intellectual view is. Dzogchen view is not an intellectual posture, it is a personal experience of instant presence, and no amount of "correct" Buddhist thinking will lead you to that personal experience of your primordial state, and no amount of "incorrect" non-Buddhist thinking will prevent you from having that personal experience of your primordial state if you diligently apply the teaching in practice having received direct

introduction.

People seem not to realize that this is precisely what is stated in many Dzogchen tantras and upadeshas.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 10:31 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Buddhism is an illusory upaya...

Malcolm wrote:

Then all your sturm and drung and breast beating is rather unnecessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Some never fully abandon contradictory beliefs to Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

Including Buddhists as we can clearly see on this forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:59 AM

Title: Re: Consciousness & the Brain

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In Abhidharma yes, matter comes from mind. In Dzogchen, no. Matter comes from the non-recognition of the five lights.

The mind ultimately comes from the ignorance of non-recognition. The ignorance of non-recognition itself is predicated on a dispensible or relative latent awareness that exists at the time of the basis in the basis and is a function of the movement of vāyu or rlung in the basis, the movement that is responsible for the arising of the basis from the basis. When the display of the basis is recognized as being ones own display, that latent awareness becomes prajñā, when it does not, it becomes avidyā.

Consciousness is produced by the body, but it is not primarily located in the brain. It is located in the heart. Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

Bhusuku said:

I find the things you're writing about this topic very interesting and very useful, especially your(?) translations from the Khandro Nyinthig. But since I'm a slow learner and not that particularly bright, I'd like to ask if you can point me to any book where these things are discussed in greater detail?

Malcolm wrote:

Not in English. apart from Lipman's translation of the some of the same materials in the KN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:57 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

If you bother to read any of the traditional accounts D&G, you will find out that Dzogchen was met with total hostility from Indian Buddhists by and large. Malcom, I really appreciate your way to judge with open mind and intellectual autonomy the atrocities of tibetan feudal society and the big incongruencies you mentioned in various posts. I am serious.

But with the same open mind and intellectual autonomy you should recognize that traditional accounts are often quite far from reality, leaving a lot of incongruency without solutions, such as the indication that Garab dorje born in the second century BC and he transmitted also teaching to Padmasambhava at the same time, having more about 1000 years gap without solutions.

For this reason I take in consideration the positions of various modern western scholars who doubt the entire story you mention, because as it is impossible having Garab dorje contemporary of Padmasambhava as the traditional accounts report, it make sense doubting the indian or oddiyana origin of Dzogchen because of lack of historical evidence

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen definitely has an Indian/Oḍḍiyāna origin. Guhyagarbha proves it.

If you wish to refrain from judging whether seventeen tantras, etc., are native Tibetan compositions or not, I can understand this. There are certainly a lot of reasons to suspect that they are, or if they are actually translations then they are very free translations. factually speaking, no one has done enough work on the 17 tantra to know for sure. to identify layers of composition etc.

I can tell you from my research they are very homogenous, and seem to be composed by a single author or small group. Some sections read like translations from an Indic language, other sections read like straight up Tibetan. My guess honestly is that they are

mixture of both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Dronma said:

They freely consider themselves as Buddhists! [/b]

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, there are also many people in the DC who consider themselves Buddhists. I know this, obviously, since I used to be one of them.

There are people who consider themselves buddhists and christians, etc. No problem for me at all.

And there are a lot of people in teh DC who do not consider themselves Buddhist at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Sonam,

Tunhuang texts you mentioned are Dzog chen texts - very simple and elementar - who prove, if ever, that dzogchen had a chinese diffusion (Shri Simha origin was chinese as you probably know), but they do not prove that Dzog chen had an Indian diffusion at all.

Furthermore I am not claiming that dzog chen tantra as Kunjed Gyalpo is faulse, as Dzog Chen detractor loved to state. I am discussing here about another subject: that accoridng to Modern western independent scholar there is no evidence of the Dzog chen Indian diffusion

Malcolm wrote:

Shri Singha's nationality is quite debatable -- some people think he was Indo-chinese, other's think he was from central asia. The texts are not very clear. In any event, what is clear is that he met Vimalamitra in India, as well as Vairocana.

As far as your contention above, then you have a hard time explaining Dzogchen in the Guhyagarbha which is a text of proven Indian provenance.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:32 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Dronma said:

They consider themselves as Buddhists also.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no they don't. I can introduce you to many people I know very well in the DC who just do not think of themselves as Buddhist, and if you ask them, they will deny they are Buddhists. If you tell them are taking refuge in Buddha, Dharma and Sangha, they will say, no, I am taking refuge in the Guru, deva and dakini.

Trust me, for years I told all these people they were Buddhists even if they did not care to label themselves such. Then I understood, and now I accept their point of view. Also I don't feel that need anymore to belong to the religion called "buddhism". And I am pretty expert in "Buddhism", ask anyone -- that is why I have an Acarya degree from the Sakya school, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Yes...which is why ChNN encourages his Christian students to continue to go to church if they like. I know one member of the DC who is really into the Dzogchen teachings, was a member of the Tsegyalgar Gakyil a couple of years ago, and who is presently studying in a Baptist seminary in Kentucky. His facebook page combines Dzogchen symbols like A, Aom, and Hūṃ with Jesus and the Apostles.

Despite the fact you seem enthusiastic in presenting this nice melt pot Christian-Dzogchen as a step forward in Dzogchen free diffusion in the global village, it would be interesting to understand how this guy can at the same time follow dzog chen view, where there is no God to pray and the only ultimate refuge is your own nature of mind (as explained in Lonchen Nyntig as for the ultimate Gururyoga), with the teistic Christian approach when you can be saved only because of the grace of Jesus and you have to pray him as a god in order to be saved.

These are 2 tawas very difficult to practice at the same time.....

Malcolm wrote:

As ChNN says, if you regard god a symbol of your primordial potentiality, then there is no problem. In any event, you can just keep assuming that your point of view is right until you decide differently. For example, last night I had a discussion with an SMS teacher, and he felt there was no problem at all in including Jesus in your refuge tree.

I used to be like you, a True Buddhist(tm) member of Dzogchen Community and always

had (minor) arguments with people who did share your (and my former) POV. I gave it up because my former view (your present view) and Rinpoches teachings on these issues do not correspond. There are very few people I know in the community that have your POV. But it is ok, I respect it even if I don't agree with it for many reasons, not least of which is that I read Tibetan fluently and have access to the originals.

But I did not give up my former POV based on ChNN's say so. I gave it up because I personally understood that all this stuff which is so important to you, dronma, magnus, adamantine, greg and kalsang yungdrung was completely extraneous to the teachings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

[

" Buddhist ostility was the cause of Dzog chen desappearing in India" as if it were matter of fact, as you do.

Malcolm wrote:

If you bother to read any of the traditional accounts D&G, you will find out that Dzogchen was met with total hostility from Indian Buddhists by and large.

When Vimalamitra left for Tibet, he brought the sole copy of Nyingthig cycle with him, as well as the remaining texts of sems sde and klong sde.

rdzogs pa chen po, incidentally, in the language of Oḍḍiyāna is santimahā, not mahāsandhi (Sanskrit).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Consciousness & the Brain

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

jeeprs said:

And vice versa?

Malcolm wrote:

You can draw that inference if you like. It is controversial from a Buddhist standpoint, but not from a Dzogchen standpoint.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Paul said:

Hi Malcolm - thanks for posting all that.

Most of that, especially sections like this:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, to begin with, the body is formed by ignorance of the wisdom of basis. The nature of wisdom in that body is the refined part of the five elements, present in the material bindu as the play of the kāyas and wisdoms. Since their luminous radiance arose as light, it is given the name "three wisdoms".

Paul said:

seems to be linked to the theory and practice of togal. Is it of any direct relevance to the practice of trekcho?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it explains how one's impure vision evolved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Male and female

Content:

justsit said:

A woman is born with all the eggs she will ever have, 1-2 million. Only one to maybe 9-10 eggs max are available during each monthly cycle, contrasted with billions of sperm per ejaculation. At fertilization, one egg is fertilized by one sperm. How does "profuse" apply here to determine sex?

Malcolm wrote:

It basically has to do with how the quantity of female sexual fluids during the time of arousal, or amount of ejaculate. This is how I understand it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes I see that now. You are right. I'm sorry I doubted what you said.

Malcolm wrote:

It makes our job as Dzogchen practitioners a lot easier. Of course if it is useful, we can study anything. But after a certain point, spending time on becoming expert in Madhyamaka, or Mahayoga, etc., is kind of a waste of time unless you are going to be a teacher. Even then, maybe not so useful. This is why I abandoned my sutra studies for Medicine. Medicine is useful, Dzogchen is useful -- the rest of it is not so useful. Someday the Dzogchen tantras and texts like Khandro Nyingthig will be available and people will be able to focus on Dzogchen teachings alone.

Also, the above is just an indication, it is not enough for practice. You need to find a qualified teacher to practice the above. Fortunately, klong sde is sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Wow thanks Malcolm!

Paul - many thanks too!

Malcolm wrote:

As I said to understand Dzogchen all you need to understand is the five elements, and to cut grasping to solidity, the examples of illusion, how else do you think illiterate cowherds can attain rainbow body -- of course at a certain point their prajñā flowers and they understand everything without need to study.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Adamantine said:

Statements like this prove to me you have really missed my point.

Malcolm wrote:

So maybe express your point more clearly. [/quote]

I expressed it pretty clearly, but people keep on coming with whatifs and maybes.

My point was only this -- anyone at all can practice Dzogchen a) without abandoning their previous faith b) without converting to Buddhism.

Adamantine said:

I don't think he means that, but is that what you are saying?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes...which is why ChNN encourages his Christian students to continue to go to church if they like. I know one member of the DC who is really into the Dzogchen teachings, was a member of the Tsegylgar Gakyil a couple of years ago, and who is presently studying in a Baptist seminary in Kentucky. His facebook page combines Dzogchen symbols like A, Aom, and Hūṃ with Jesus and the Apostles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

Malcolm, is this the Kunnu Lama you were talking about?

[http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Khunu_Lama_Tenzin_Gyaltsen "](http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Khunu_Lama_Tenzin_Gyaltsen)
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

AilurusFulgens said:

May I ask, what is the reference for the statement that Kunnu Lama met sadhus in Varanasi in the 1930s, who were Cakrasamvara practitioners. I am very interested in this. In which text was this mentioned?

Malcolm wrote:

Oral communication to me by one of his western students.

AilurusFulgens said:

Do you think that these traditions still exist today? I mean unbroken, native Indian lineages of Vajrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

AilurusFulgens said:

Btw, I read the excellent article about Buddhaguptanatha written by Templeman and would concur with your view that the situation concerning the destruction of Vajrayana in India is much more complex than it appears to be.

It would be interesting to see the true extent of the connections between the Nathas and Vajrayana - apart from the token "Gorakshanatha is one of the 84 Mahasiddhas".

Malcolm wrote:

And the fact that the 80 Siddhas are mentioned as part of the Nath lineage.

AilurusFulgens said:

Is there any indication that the Nathas might have practiced Dzogchen teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no idea. But Nathas used to visit Tibet a lot and it is possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The elements form from the non-recognition of of the five lights of connected with the five wisdoms.

Andrew108 said:

This is particularly hard to grasp since the elements described here seem to be co-emergent with individual ignorance. Or is it more that the elements are 'held in place' as a conceptual form rather than how they are originally constructed? Is it possible to elaborate on this? How would the element of water form from the non-recognition of the five lights? Hope you can help.

Malcolm wrote:

The Khandro Nyinthig states:

Since that mind arose as automatic manifestation of six mental apprehenders, the five elements are produced. Since those are not recognized as the five wisdoms, the five elements assemble in dependence upon grasping those [five wisdoms]. Since those assemble, the body forms through the action of one [element] assisting the other. With that forms the apprehended and the apprehender.

And: As such, that basis, the natural reality of things, the great intrinsic energy of wisdom, the dharmakāya, was not recognized, and because of the stains of grasping to it, the elements assemble; the body forms from them, and based on that [body], one wanders in samsara until one ages and dies.

And: Since the five energies of wisdom are unceasing, the body forms from the five elements. Since two kāyas are integrated with the relative elements, that previous understanding of the intrinsic energy of wisdom is totally forgotten. The ultimate four elements is the dharmakāya, the relative four elements is the sambogakāya.

Nirmanakāya is the lack of sameness and difference of the two kāyas.

And: To sum it all up, ignorant attachment to dualistic appearances assembles the energy of wisdom into the elements, and forms the body in actuality.

And: Energy is produced unceasingly from that wisdom. Since that energy was not recognized, that apparent and natureless radiant luminosity of wisdom arose as the empty luminosity of the five lights. [430] Within that, since this thinker of thoughts

grasps the unceasing energy of wisdom, and since that five colored energy is assembled as the elements, therefore, the body, flesh, blood, warmth, breath, channels and so on are formed from that energy of wisdom. For as long as the mind and the body do not separate, the channels, vāyus, bindus, wisdoms and so on are inseparable. Since that is not recognized as such and the one is grasped as many, like the nameless becoming named, since the five wisdoms, the five afflictions, and so on are divisions in one thing, also those wishing for Buddhahood have aggregates, without contacting the meaning of this even slightly. With this everything is recognized as coming from the energy of wisdom. Since inseparability is recognized, therefore the defiled also comes from the energy of wisdom. Also that self-liberated from the mind, and as the defiled does not appear, Buddhahood is attained in the expanse of wisdom. Therefore, it is inseparable. Others hold them as different, and respond with practice.

And:... after the body formed because the energy of initial vidyā was not recognized as wisdom, there is delusion because of the grasping of materiality, and wandering in samsara.

And: The relative material bindu is the intrinsic radiance of those five wisdoms of the originally pure dharmadhātu externally manifesting as five lights, after which, the elements are produced upon the mere traces of grasping of the mind. Further, the natural reality of that mind (that established in anyway) is space. Whether that is like this or not, the energy of that vivid luminosity arising as the diversity, that is called “vāyu”, it is called “mind”. Though luminosity is called mind, because of movement, it is called “vāyu”. When examined, it is not established in anyway. Also luminosity is not established, also movement is not established, also inseparability is not established.

Since that is not recognized, since that energy that grasps so called “vāyu” produces heat, there is fire. For example, just as when sweat and heat is produced when a person does hard work, [fire] is produced from that grasping onto heat. When the heat of fire touches the ground, water is produced in the form of vapor. Since grasping onto that energy of wisdom arose, the outer five elements are produced, caused one by one. The five elements form matter. Since grasping onto that arose, the five elements assemble, and the body forms through the condition of the five refined parts of those [elements], one by one.

If it is asked why, now then to begin with, the energy of wisdom is vāyu, from that is heat; from that, earth; from that, water: since each assists another, the body develops more i.e. the body actually forms out of the refined part of the five elements. That [body] is pervaded by the refined part of the five elements. The refined parts and that energy of wisdom are given the name “channels, vāyus, and bindu”. The energy of wisdom is the five elements. Since wisdom is present in them, there are five wisdoms. That is given the name material bindu. Wisdom is inseparably present within that material bindu.

And: Further, to begin with, the body is formed by ignorance of the wisdom of basis. The nature of wisdom in that body is the refined part of the five elements, present in the material bindu as the play of the kāyas and wisdoms. Since their luminous radiance arose as light, it is given the name “three wisdoms”.

And: Though the body is formed from ignorance of the basis, as soon as that is recognized, it is not beyond wisdom in the beginning, the end and in the middle.

Etc. this text just goes on and on in the same vein.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

muni said:

The old kadampa from Lama Atisha, respected by the Nyingmapa is not the new kadampa from Je Tsongkapa, which came later.

Malcolm wrote:

The main opponents of Dzogchen in the tenth century in Tibet were the Kadampas, hence Rongzom's Theg chen tshul 'jug, Introduction to Mahāyāna Principles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

it is uncorrect under many POVs proposing the reduction that dzogchen disappeared from India because of Buddhist hostility.

Well Malcom but you did not answer to the main point above

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, thought you knew your Dzogchen history better. There was only one copy of the Dzogchen tantras, according to the traditional accounts and it existed at Nalanda. When the Nalanda panditas, hostile to Dzogchen already (they didn't very much like all this talk about a result without a cause, a buddhahood that does not come from mind, and an upadesha that is not based on citations), heard that Vimala had been invited to Tibet, they dispatched with him the last remaining copies of the Dzogchen tantras in India and Dzogchen vanished forever from the Indian Subcontinent thenceforth. So it is absolutely correct to observe that Dzogchen disappeared from India due to Buddhist hostility against Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

The answer is that due to Buddhist hostility against Dzogchen teachings, Dzogchen completely died out in India. It was preserved in Tibet by Tibetans.

Malcom, As matter of fact not only Dzogchen disappeared from India, but all Buddhism in general, Vajrayana included, due to the Muslims' activity.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna survived in India until at least the 16th century, as witnessed by the fact that one of Taranatha's most important gurus was Nath sadhu by the name of Buddhaguptanatha, from whom Taranatha received the Tarayogini tantra and transmissions, which had not been brought to Tibet prior to this time. There are another Nath, by the name of Vajranatha, who in the 15th century taught Drikung Rinchen Phunstok as well as Khyentse Wangchuck an important collection of teachings which continues in both Sakya and Drikung. The demise of Vajrayāna in India is greatly overstated. In fact Kunnu Lama recounts meeting sadhus who were Cakrasamvara practitioners in the 1930s when he was in Varanasi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

That Bonpos "don't feel" them not Buddhist, that is more a word game in so far Bon has a Buddha inside their Lineage.

But we have Chos Pas and Bon Pos and not Buddhists inside Tibet, remarkable.

Also misunderstood for non-Bonpos, that the Buddha Shakyamuni was a student from the Bon Buddha, so he is known in Bon by name.

So Bon can sure be called Buddhist in that sense but is spoken different, for some reasons.

Malcolm wrote:

And up until the HHDL accepted Bon as a "fifth school" of Tibetan Buddhism, most so called chos pa would not accept bonpos as "nang pas" i.e. insiders. You just read Dudjom Rinpoche's highly critical remarks about Bon in his History of the Nyingma School

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Adamantine said:

I just think anyone who wants to practice Dzogchen is inevitably practicing the Buddhadharma. . .

Malcolm wrote:

There are just as many concepts in Dzogchen that absolutely contradict accepted Buddhist ideas.

Adamantine said:

Do you agree with him now?

Malcolm wrote:

Why would I agree with that? Statements like this prove to me you have really missed my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Mariusz said:

To have faith for example in no bardo state after death at all, and practice rushen according to it, is the experiment. I don't like further to write on rushen because I'm not allowed.

Malcolm wrote:

I understand your position now -- you have to accept Buddhist teachings otherwise you are not suitable candidate for Dzogchen -- is that about right? Otherwise you are "experimenting", which is a bad thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

No, I wasn't asking about ethnicity.. I was asking about Buddhist background. .You cry murder when you feel someone else twists your words but like to freely do it yourself.

Josef said:

Why does it matter?

On this planet at least we can probably say that there are none without the Bon or Buddhist background yet.

But again, why does this matter?

Malcolm wrote:

It matters because for them Dzogchen is "Buddhist", with a charitable shout out to the recently validated "Buddhist" Bonpos.

And you have a good point, there are also thirteen other world systems where Dzogchen is taught. I don't think you will find a Buddhist or Bonpo sangha in any of them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Yeah, who are the great Dzogchen masters in the last few centuries that didn't have a Buddhist or Buddhist-colored Bon background?

Malcolm wrote:

First, I thought you were referring to those with monastic educations from the way you framed your question --my error.

The question is who in the past 1000 years has been a great Dzogchen master who was not Tibetan. The answer is that due to Buddhist hostility against Dzogchen teachings, Dzogchen completely died out in India. It was preserved in Tibet by Tibetans. So only Tibetans have been great Dzogchen masters for many centuries.

That will now change.

Adamantine said:

No, I wasn't asking about ethnicity.. I was asking about Buddhist background. .You cry murder when you feel someone else twists your words but like to freely do it yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

The Bonpos don't feel influenced by Buddhism so, unless you are gainsaying them, there have been many great Bonpo Dzogchen masters since the 10th century, beginning with Shenchen Luga. You may wish to insist they are Buddhist, but I remember when we shut down the Bon forum because on E-Sangha because Kalsang Yundrung refused to admit he took refuge in Sakyamuni Buddha as a Bonpo. We decided that E-Sangha was for Buddhists, and Bonpos were not included under that rubric. Bonpos sure don't feel Buddhist. Try telling Loppon Tenzin Namdag he is a Buddhist and see how far you get.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Mariusz said:

I'm not so brave to experiment with other yet incompatible supports like other religions/atheism. So I'd like the quickest

Malcolm wrote:

Yet another misconception -- no one has suggested experimenting with other religions.

To reiterate, people may, if they are interested, learn and practice Dzogchen without

converting to Buddhism or abandoning their previous faiths. What is so difficult to understand about this statement?

I have nowhere said that anyone should feel compelled to rush out and become a Hari Krishna. I have basically said that a Dzogchen practitioner should feel free to go anywhere and study anything they feel will be useful for their personal path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Yeah, who are the great Dzogchen masters in the last few centuries that didn't have a Buddhist or Buddhist-colored Bon background?

Malcolm wrote:

First, I thought you were referring to those with monastic educations from the way you framed your question --my error.

The question is who in the past 1000 years has been a great Dzogchen master who was not Tibetan. The answer is that due to Buddhist hostility against Dzogchen teachings, Dzogchen completely died out in India. It was preserved in Tibet by Tibetans. So only Tibetans have been great Dzogchen masters for many centuries.

That will now change.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Male and female

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If semen is more profuse, it will be a boy. If the ovum is more profuse then it will be a girl. If both are in equal portion, then the child will be homosexual or intersexed.

M

justsit said:

Do you mean profuse as in absolute numbers?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in terms of quantity.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
Isn't it interesting that such a vastly realized Dzogchenpa could emerge from such a corrupt system such as Tibetan Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:
Lotuses grow in mud.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
So where is there an example of a great master of Dzogchen in the last 1000 years who didn't have this background?

Malcolm wrote:
Are you serious?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
So whose personal experience of the bardos and the purelands are we talking about, -- which practitioners exactly?

Malcolm wrote:
Since you don't know the answers to these questions I suggest you ask your teacher.

M

Adamantine said:
I wouldn't ask my teacher about your claims.. I am asking you.

Malcolm wrote:
One can understand the experience of the bardo of dharmatā and the pure nirmanakāya buddhafi elds experientially in this life, you don't have to wait. If you want to understand this experientially, ask your teacher. I am not your teacher, so don't ask me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Timeless awareness" is a translator's gloss of the term ye shes. You cannot understand Dzogchen without understand the terms and a bit of tibetan grammer. These are the various ways this term has been translated:

ye shes - jnana, (exalted, primordial) wisdom, (primal, transcending, original, unitary, authentic, pure, absolute, a priori, genuine, spiritual, ever-fresh, pristine) awareness, wakefulness, pristine cognition, mystic illumination, gnosis, understanding by peak experience, (intuitive, transcending, comprehensive, true) knowledge, SA mched pa'i ye shes, mnyam nyid ye shes, me long ye shes, chos dbyings ye shes, bya sgrub ye shes, sor rtog ye shes, perfect absolute divine wisdom, pristine wisdom, primordial awareness, timeless awareness

Since the brain is made of five elements, it too is made of the five wisdoms (ye shes) of vidyā. Therefore, there is no problem with awareness, etc., having a basis in the body. Actually, what we say in Dzogchen is that the wisdom of vidyā is located in the heart, the energy of vidyā is located in the brain, where it governs sense organs and cognitions.

M

Andrew108 said:

Thanks Malcolm very useful. I understand the 'ever-fresh' aspect to it in the sense that it's so fresh that it seems unborn, but in what way can ye she be said to come into existence? I mean if ye shes is indeterminate or ever-fresh then in what sense are the elements 'formed'? What accounts for perceived 'duration' of the elements'?

Malcolm wrote:

Ye nas means "has always been...", it contrasts another grammatical phrase rtag tu i.e. "...will always be".

Wisdom has no origin, it formed naturally. Hence the metaphor of the peacock feather.

The elements form from the non-recognition of of the five lights of connected with the five wisdoms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

You keep talking about that, "personal experience" at the same time you keep talking about the realization of Dzogchen practice not being fully accomplished until the bardo, or some time in purelands, for the majority of practitioners.

So whose personal experience are we referring to here?

Malcolm wrote:

The practitioners, of course.

Adamantine said:

So whose personal experience of the bardos and the purelands are we talking about, -- which practitioners exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

Since you don't know the answers to these questions I suggest you ask your teacher.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 30th, 2012 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Anders said:

What does that make Longchenpa? Was he just being a Buddhist apologist when he wrote the Great Chariot?

No small amount of hubris in some of the statements being made here.

Sönam said:

Sorry, I am not able to set a relation between what I've said and what you answer.

Longchenpa, like all we are had his own culture, but why would he be an apologist? You mean Longchenpa was all along on the institution side?

Sorry, develop please

Sönam

Anders said:

I mean Longchenpa wrote extensively on the integration of Dzogchen into a graduated 9-yana scheme, in works such as the Great Chariot. To reduce all this to no more than the political pressure of Buddhist institutions that we can now do away with as an artefact of history reads to my mind like saying that works like the Great Chariot are in fact no more than apologetic propaganda for 'the institution'.

Malcolm wrote:

The Great Chariot was written pretty early Longchenpa's career. As such it presents the standard tantra, agama, upadesha approach to Dzogchen made famous at Kathog monastery combined with the so called kadampa style bstan rim (stages of the teachings). He was educated at the Kadampa University, Sangphu.

Other texts such as the yod bzhin mdzod and the grub mtha' mdzod are mainly polemical defenses of Dzogchen trying to site it within the nine yānas scheme.

Texts such as the tshig don mdzod, chos dbyings mdzod, theg mchog mdzod, and the gnas lugs mdzod however present Dzogchen itself in and of itself, as an independent vehicle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

You keep talking about that, "personal experience" at the same time you keep talking about the realization of Dzogchen practice not being fully accomplished until the bardo, or some time in purelands, for the majority of practitioners.

So whose personal experience are we referring to here?

Malcolm wrote:

The practitioners, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Still don't agree with that Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you need to reread your history of Dzogchen in India and in Tibet. I think you missed some chapters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Dzogchen is no longer presented as the apex of years of practice of other yanas. The practitioner starts with Dzogchen practice and ends with Dzogchen practice.

heart said:

While you are doing the list on corrupt Lama's could you please make a list of Lama's that teach Dzogchen in this way? I never met even one.

/magnus

Sherlock said:

Namkhai Norbu and KDL. Probably a few others too, I think

<http://youngedrodulling.org/2012retreat.shtml> is doing that as well for one.

Malcolm wrote:

FAIK, only ChNN and KDL. Not Khachab.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

The only thing I didn't like was his idea that Dzogchen in reality was foreign to both Buddhism and Bon. This I don't agree on.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, what I said was that the primary hostility aimed at Dzogchen has always come from Buddhists. I said that the Bonpoas were never hostile to Dzogchen. They incorporated it in everything, even their "abidharma".

Funny, you are the first person ever to call me "dramatic".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Malcolm and Dechen and everyone else that feel that Tibetan Buddhism is just a about money, power and sex. Please, in the interest of all can you list all corrupt teachers that you know about and what they have done? I think it is quite important to be open about these things and even the Dalai Lama have said that if one is sure about a Lama being corrupt one should call the newspapers (or something like that). I find it very difficult to respond to these allegations when I have no idea what you are talking about or what

your personal experience is. My personal experience with Dharma been a mixed bag but I don't know any Lama that I could call corrupt, but I might be very gullible or just lucky.

/magnus

Adamantine said:

I would appreciate this list too.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no point in trotting out a laundry list. It does not change anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When one has eliminated the traces of affliction and action in one's own five elements ones body reverts to its original state as five lights, hence "The body of light".

Andrew108 said:

Malcom - could you talk about 'timeless awareness'. I see the term in translations so often. For me the term is key because it seems to point to an awareness that is not temporal or brain-based (if we accept the commonly held view that the brain is key to temporality). Can you comment on this? Isn't time and experience mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

"Timeless awareness" is a translator's gloss of the term ye shes. You cannot understand Dzogchen without understand the terms and a bit of tibetan grammer. These are the various ways this term has been translated:

ye shes - jnana, (exalted, primordial) wisdom, (primal, transcending, original, unitary, authentic, pure, absolute, a priori, genuine, spiritual, ever-fresh, pristine) awareness, wakefulness, pristine cognition, mystic illumination, gnosis, understanding by peak experience, (intuitive, transcending, comprehensive, true) knowledge, SA mched pa'i ye shes, mnyam nyid ye shes, me long ye shes, chos dbyings ye shes, bya sgrub ye shes, sor rtog ye shes, perfect absolute divine wisdom, pristine wisdom, primordial awareness, timeless awareness

Since the brain is made of five elements, it too is made of the five wisdoms (ye shes) of vidyā. Therefore, there is no problem with awareness, etc., having a basis in the body. Actually, what we say in Dzogchen is that the wisdom of vidyā is located in the heart, the energy of vidyā is located in the brain, where it governs sense organs and cognitions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Nyala Rinpoche Rigdzin Changchub Dorje

Content:

Sherlock said:

His disciples probably, like ChNN. Actually I think it's unclear if he was really illiterate or just unschooled in all the classical literature. I hope the Communists only destroyed his discs and the texts are still somewhere.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has a complete collection of all surviving manuscripts that made it through cultural revolution.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Male and female

Content:

Virgo said:

Is there Buddhist and/or medical reasons why children are born either male or female? What causes birth as a particular sex? Are people always born as one or the other successively over lifetimes or does it change?

Thanks for any responses.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

There are reasons connected with karma and with biology. Tibetan Medicine emphasizes the biological aspect more. If semen is more profuse, it will be a boy. If the ovum is more profuse then it will be a girl. If both are in equal portion, then the child will be homosexual or intersexed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Consciousness & the Brain

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

[

You are believing in a different metaphysical system, that's all. There's nothing factual

about it. Those materialist claims about the brain creating consciousness are nothing but fallacious metaphysical extrapolations. Question that also, for goodness sake, especially because they contradict your own experience! Don't swallow hook, line and sinker.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness is produced by the body, but it is not primarily located in the brain. It is located in the heart. Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

Sherlock said:

So the vayus are technically "matter"?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are composed of the element of air (vāyu).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Clarence said:

So, one uses Thogal to bring the 5 elements back to the 5 lights?

Malcolm wrote:

When one has eliminated the traces of affliction and action in one's own five elements one's body reverts to its original state as five lights, hence "The body of light".

Clarence said:

And one uses Thogal to accomplish that?

Malcolm wrote:

or klong sde, or yang ti, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

No, I was not aware of this. That's very interesting. I take it you mean the first Ju Mipham left the letter? Where can one find a reference for this? Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

I think if you read any detailed bio of Mipham you can discover this fact. I forgot where I

read this, but it was in an academic work.

Perhaps in Kapstein. In any event, as far as I am concerned there are no tulkus of Mipham who are in reality reincarnations of Mipham.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Consciousness & the Brain

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

[

You are believing in a different metaphysical system, that's all. There's nothing factual about it. Those materialist claims about the brain creating consciousness are nothing but fallacious metaphysical extrapolations. Question that also, for goodness sake, especially because they contradict your own experience! Don't swallow hook, line and sinker.

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness is produced by the body, but it is not primarily located in the brain. It is located in the heart. Even during the process of the rebirth, there is a never a time a when there is a mind is separate from matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

...but other are incompatible for complete realization of Dzogchen including the 4 visions.

Malcolm wrote:

Right. I understand how you feel. I just don't happen to agree with you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Clarence said:

So, one uses Thogal to bring the 5 elements back to the 5 lights?

Malcolm wrote:

When one has eliminated the traces of affliction and action in one's own five elements one's body reverts to its original state as five lights, hence "The body of light".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I have no problem with this except that I personally feel incapable to, among the huge amount of worldly Dharma systems that exist, even guess which are of short term or long term benefit. I certainly can't say if any of them will eventually lead to liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

All of them are Samantabhadra's vehicles.

heart said:

Of course, at this point you are debating with ChNNs statement. But I will endeavor to set out what I take away from it. People have generated traditions around Dzogchen. Those traditions are secondary. The rig pa'i rtsal dbang is much misunderstood. It is not a ritual, though it can be packaged in one. The rig pa'i rtsal dbang is direct introduction. Dzogchen transmission depends solely on direct introduction. Direct introduction can be given in myriad ways, there is no set tradition. Which of these interpretation of "tradition" do you think ChNNR intend? Because certainly some of these above does corresponds pretty good with both Dzogchen and Dzogchen Community.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is not Dzogchen, just like the thun book is not Dzogchen practice.

heart said:

No matter how direct introduction is achieved, it certainly can happen in many different ways, ChNNR himself have regularly been given three special transmissions every year according to a preset and that can, at least to a certain degree be called a ritual.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a rite that goes with the WW transmission days. But direct introduction is not restricted to that and does not depend on that.

heart said:

The Dzogchen tantras themselves maintain that no distinction is made in Dzogchen between those of higher capacity and lower capacity, good karmic accumulations or negative.

Well, Jigme Lingpa certainly do that distinction in the Yeshe Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer to follow what Dzogchen tantras say. Tri Yeshe Lama is important, but it is not the end all be all of Dzogchen.

heart said:

Quite literally there are differences between the paths of renunciation (yānas 1-3), transformation (4-8), and self-liberation (ati).

As I have pointed out endlessly, there is a difference between Hināyāna and Mahāyāna, for example. Important differences in vows, conduct, practice, methods, etc. What is permissible in one is not permissible in the other. This also applies to Vajrayāna - what is permissible in Vajrayāna is not permissible in Mahāyāna. In Dzogchen there are no rules.

That things are different don't mean that they are incompatible or in any kind of conflict.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen practitioners can and should eat meat. Mahāyanists should never eat meat. If you want to wish away the various contradictions that exist in the three or nine yānas, which are demonstrated in tantras such as kun byed rgyal po to be mistakes and deviations, feel free.

heart said:

Sakyamuni did not teach Dzogchen so far as anyone knows -- there is no record of it in the original tantras of Dzogchen.

Except that he, for example in the Vima Nyingthik, is counted among the twelve Dzogchen Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as has been pointed out endlessly, the reason for this is not that he taught Dzogchen, but because he predicted Garab Dorje. Also, the source of the twelve teachers is sgra thal gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Because the sympathy for the Teachings of the Buddha one is called a Buddhist and not anymore a Muslim etc.

Mariusz said:

I agree with this approach. Having it no any intolerance and bias is needed. Also no any need for the new theory of "universal Dzogchen for every religion" or something fancy the same.

Malcolm wrote:

Not Dzogchen for every religion -- Dzogchen for every person regardless of religion.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 8:23 PM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Paul said:

I really recommend reading through all of Malcolm's posts on this issue to clarify things.

asunthatneversets said:

I do too but I'm not sure if a materialist view is being propagated. I don't discount the fact that gross physicality is unbelievably compelling and seems 100% real but investigate this belief. The body in a dream can also seem very real and subject to compelling experiences.

Malcolm wrote:

The five elements form out of the five light of the wisdom of rigpa under the influence of ignorance. Everything is made out of the five elements. The division between sentient and non-sentient appears, but do not believe in it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

You really think Christians, Jews, Muslims, Jains, Rastafarians, Atheists, Agnostics, Scientific Materialists, Nihilists in general.. you think they can all easily accept and participate in Dzogchen teachings and practice when a big part of it is regarding Bardos and Buddhafields? And you believe that these teachings are not Buddhist?

Who is going to spend all of their time practicing something that most likely they will never see the biggest benefit from until after they die, in the "bardo" or "pureland", when they don't believe in bardos or purelands?

Malcolm wrote:

Since Dzogchen is based on personal experience, anyone can practice if they are interested, no matter what they believe. If they are not interested, what can we do? But if they are interested, they do not need to be converted to Buddhism in order to benefit from Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 29th, 2012 at 7:30 PM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Let's take another example: the 17th Karmapa Thaye Trinley Dorje is a tulku, recognised by tulkus, whose father is a tulku (the third Ju Mipham)

Malcolm wrote:

This is a littel off topic -- but you do realize that Mipham left a letter expressly stating that he was not coming back as a tulku at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Chandrakirti, Prasanapada

[Valid cognitions and valid objects] are established through mutual dependence . When valid cognitions exist, then there are things that are objects of comprehension. When there are things that are objects of comprehension then they are valid cognitions. However neither valid cognitions nor objects of comprehension exist essentially

Malcolm wrote:

The point the Vigravahavyavartani makes is that they cannot be mutually established. If a pramāṇā is a pramāṇa, it does not need a prameya; and vice versa.

M

cloudburst said:

As always, one must examine the discussion in its own context. This point made by the Vigravahavyavartani is directed at Nyayika logicians who are attempting to show that an independent pramana, which had already been shown by Nagarjuna to be in impossibility, is mutually established with it's independent object. Nagarjuna shoots down this move and explains that these two cannot be mutually established since establishing something that is already established would make no sense.

As the quotation from Chandrakirti demonstrates, neither valid cognitions nor objects of comprehension exist independently, but they are established in mutual dependence.

Therefore your point

Malcolm wrote:

Then you must admit that valid objects exist. Then you must explain their existence. This can only be done if you accept independent existence.

cloudburst said:
is refuted and done.

Malcolm wrote:
What you fail to recognize is that there was no system of Buddhist pramāṇa at this time. Bhavaviveka's interest in syllogism is post-Dignaga etc.

Since there can be no ultimately established prameya, there can be no ultimately established pramāṇa, and if you argue they established mutually, they are relative and therefore, not ultimate.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 9:56 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Andrew108 said:

...but Dzogchen in my opinion is impossible to value fully if 1. you haven't built a Buddhist identity and had Dzogchen deconstruct it and 2. you haven't at least understood the implications of absence of self.

Malcolm wrote:
I respect your opinion, but I differ because this is not how it is taught in the original Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 9:50 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

heart said:
So you actually consider Dzogchen Dharma? Does Dharma include any other parts of Buddhism for you?

Malcolm wrote:
Dharma includes all nine yānas. To the extent that so called "Buddhists" and "non-Buddhists" comport with one or another of these yānas, they are Dharma practitioners. To the extent they do not, they are not. "Buddhism" is a label. Dharma is a practice. One is a category, one is a function. You can call yourself a "buddhist" and not practice Dharma -- there are many people like this. You can not call yourself a "buddhist" and be a Dharma practitioner, there are also many people like this. You can call yourself a "buddhist" and be a Dharma practitioner, there are also many people like this.

There are many Dharmas out there for many different people. Some of those Dharmas do not fit in the category of "Buddhism" i.e. the Dharma directly taught by the Buddha, but because they lead people to better rebirths, result in happiness in this life, and so on -- these systems are considered Dharma and if people practice according to them, eventually they will achieve total liberation. Even though these so called tirthika systems are couched on a metaphysical language of unacceptable to Buddhists, and so on, even here it is possible that people can have profound experiences. This is obvious because they report it to be so.

heart said:

Isn't it true that there is a rather large set of teachings of Dzogchen that do have a tradition? This tradition seems to have been rather private, meaning closed doors (even a guard)? There is even one tradition of the "nyengyu" that is only from one person to one other. There is a tradition of transmitting the text i.e. given "lung" of the texts you give teaching on. There is a tradition of giving "rigpai tsal wang" to the student. So what exactly do you mean with no tradition here when talking about Dzogchen as a teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, at this point you are debating with ChNNs statement. But I will endeavor to set out what I take away from it. People have generated traditions around Dzogchen. Those traditions are secondary. The rig pa'i rtsal dbang is much misunderstood. It is not a ritual, though it can be packaged in one. The rig pa'i rtsal dbang is direct introduction. Dzogchen transmission depends solely on direct introduction. Direct introduction can be given in myriad ways, there is no set tradition.

heart said:

I agree on this but I fail to see any serious conflict. Various ways of presenting the teaching dependent on the persons listening exist also in Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen tantras themselves maintain that no distinction is made in Dzogchen between those of higher capacity and lower capacity, good karmic accumulations or negative.

heart said:

Teachings are a coherent way to present the Dharma so that it will benefit the persons listening. This however can happen at many different levels at the same time. This is because of the superior qualities of Dharma. I for example often feel that no matter on what level my Guru teach I hear Dzogchen. In this way I don't, in a very direct way, feel any conflict between Dzogchen and sutra/tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite literally there are differences between the paths of renunciation (yānas 1-3), transformation (4-8), and self-liberation (ati).

As I have pointed out endlessly, there is a difference between Hināyāna and Mahāyāna,

for example. Important differences in vows, conduct, practice, methods, etc. What is permissible in one is not permissible in the other. This also applies to Vajrayāna - what is permissible in Vajrayāna is not permissible in Mahāyāna. In Dzogchen there are no rules.

heart said:

For this reason I also feel that it is quite possible that Shakyamuni was a Dzogchen teacher even if a lineage of these teachings don't remain today.

Malcolm wrote:

Sakyamuni did not teach Dzogchen so far as anyone knows -- there is no record of it in the original tantras of Dzogchen.

heart said:

From a Dzogchen point of view for sure Shakyamuni's realization can't have been that different from for example Garab Dorje because then it would not have been enlightenment, it would have been something completely different.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Not all nirmanakāya buddhas teach Vajrayāna, let alone Dzogchen. Not all buddhas teach a Vinaya and establish a monastic Sangha (such as Sikkhins). Not all buddhas teach Mahāyāna. All nirmanakāya buddhas are the same in terms of realization -- but their teachings, retinue, place, and time are all different. For example, when the buddha of hell manifests for hell beings, I am sure he is not teaching them Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 11:51 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

That is perhaps another issue, but there are many animal rights activists who don't like pet ownership. Pet ownership could be phased out too or alternatively there are vegetarian dog foods that can be made with all the nutrition and protein a dog needs. Cats on the other hand are pretty strict carnivores. As the food science advances I imagine they may come up with a vegetarian alternative for cats too.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense. This is just a fantasy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 11:50 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

The world will not become completely vegetarian overnight. It would be a gradual process (if it even happened, of course this is just hypothetically speaking). Even if 10,000 new people stopped eating meat everyday, the agri-businesses would simply stop breeding the livestock so much. The breeding would slow down, even stop if necessary until everyone became vegetarian or vegan. And then you have less slaughtering going on and eventually close the slaughter houses.

Malcolm wrote:

Such sentiments display a complete lack of understanding of sustainable agriculture. It is not about agro-business. It is about environmental sanity. Environmental sanity requires animal husbandry since it is the primary way soil fertility is ensured.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 9:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Our master ChNN Rinpoche advised them - when they asked him - not to include Jesus Christ in their unification of Gurus.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not talking about the same thing, so we will end this here.

Dronma said:

Of course, Malcolm.

Talking theoretically is very easy. Making things practically grounded in our daily life, is the most difficult part!

Thank you for discussing with me.

Malcolm wrote:

Funny you should say that -- I was not talking theoretically but there is no point in carrying this further, I respect your point of view, I just think you don't understand mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Our master ChNN Rinpoche advised them - when they asked him - not to include Jesus Christ in their unification of Gurus.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not talking about the same thing, so we will end this here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 8:15 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Yes, this is true!

It is clear that Khyentse Yeshe is the successor Master of DC.

There is no doubt about it, and personally I am feeling fine!!!

Malcolm wrote:

Not just him, also his sister, who started teaching years before he was interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

But my question was about the unification of "non-buddhist" masters in the Ati Guru Yoga. Since our teacher has explained that we cannot include Jesus Christ (hence Mohammed, nor Jehovah) in the Refuge Tree, then who are those "non-buddhist" masters? [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, first of all. If you were never a Christian, or a Hindu, or never took teachings from such a master, for example, Hatha Yoga, Ayurveda, etc., then there is no need. But if you have taken teachings from such people, then you can carry this into your Ati Guru Yoga.

When we do refuge in the DC -- we generally do not do an elaborate refuge tree visualization, we do the One Jewel Unifies All system, so the principle is still the same.

It is not about including Jesus, Mohammed and so on in some imaginary refuge tree; it is about honoring the sources of all of our spritual knowledge, so the idea is completely different. It is about honoring all of our teachers, no matter what Dharma tradition they come from in the nine yānas. All Yānas belong to Samantabhadra, including the so called samsaric ones. This is the principle that is in play here. The Rigpa Rangshar states:

Though my yānas are inconceivable, when summarized,
they are included in two, samsara and nirvana

This means that all Dharma systems, "Buddhist" and "Non-Buddhist" are vehicles of Samantabhadra. If you have a connection with any of them, you unify them through the principle of Guru Yoga and go beyond limitations.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Moreover, if we have to take into account the 1st Yana, then we have to accept that the whole spectrum of the 9 Yanas is included in Dzogchen Guru Yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

I am going to present my understanding, and how I was taught by ChNN.

The reason why we can unify all teachings and teachers in Ati Guru Yoga is two-fold:

- 1) We all have the same state
- 2) This is the state we are all trying to discover, whether putatively "buddhist" or "non-buddhist"

Dronma said:

Which gives us the conclusion that no separation can be made between Dzogchen and Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Now, if we follow your logic here, since Hinduism, Christianity, etc., is part of the nine yānas too, and since the next seven are the vehicles that normally characterize "buddhism" it then follows that "Buddhism" and "Non-buddhism" cannot be separated either, and it therefore also follows we cannot separate Dzogchen from these non-buddhist religions as well.

But it is not like this. "Yāna" means vehicle. It carries you somewhere. Where? In this case, to liberation. The nine yānas are not a progressive program where you train in one yāna and then move onto the next one, like changing trains at a station or like a system of grades in a school.

Each yāna is an independent method for liberation, some are direct, like Dzogchen, some are very indirect, like the vehicle of gods and men. The rest are in the middle. So each yāna and also Dzogchen are independent vehicles. It is also the same with the three yāna scheme. One does not need to train in Hinayāna to enter Mahāyāna. One

does not need to train in Mahāyāna to enter Vajrayāna. Each of these three vehicles of a complete conveyance for liberation. The idea common in Tibetan Buddhism that you need to stack up the three yānas, in terms of the three vows, or progress through the three yānas as a gradual training. But this is not an exclusive approach. One can also enter Vajrayāna immediately.

Dzogchen can also be practiced as an intimate instruction for mahāyoga and anuyoga. So, there are two ways to approach Dzogchen -- as a completely independent vehicle, which in general is the approach of ChNN, KDL, etc., or as an intimate instruction for the inner tantras, the usual approach of the Nyingma school.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

For example, before Buddhism I was taken part in an order of western mysticism, in where I had received initiations, too. Do you think that I can include those initiators in my Dzogchen Guru Yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

You can unify everything in Ati Guru Yoga. Even the person who taught you to tie your shoes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So it is just coincidence that the "presidential" position will go to his son (a recognised tulku, whose father is a tulku) rather than ChNN's senior student? Right? Spare me Malcolm, I'm not a fool. There is no such a thing as enforced collaboration. Of course there is, collaboration under duress.

Malcolm wrote:

You really have no idea what you are talking about Greg. Khyentse Yeshe has to go through the same exams as everyone else to teach a given level of SMS. And he does not give transmissions or introduction.

But I am done trying to disabuse you of your ideas.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

After some discussion with a good friend about this thread I have decided to ask Malcolm this;

When you say "Dzogchen and Buddhism" do you mean the teaching of Dzogchen or the natural state?

Malcolm wrote:

Both. But I have clarified that I have come to make a hard distinction between "Buddhism" and Dharma. There can even be a "Dzogchen Buddhism" -- but would just be Dzogchen turned into a religion divorced from personal experience. I could care less about "Buddhism" anymore. Dharma however is important.

heart said:

Statement by ChNNR like "Dzogchen has no method, no tradition" do you think it is the natural state that is intended or the teaching of Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Both. The state of Dzogchen is your primordial state -- Dzogchen teaching is the introduction of that state through a personal experience or a direct perception or transmission of means to recapitulate that personal experience or direct perception on your own. There is no set method of performing this transmission, unlike for example, Sutra and Tantra in which there are very established traditions and methods which create a lot of attachments and limitations (read: the entire history of polemics in Buddhism).

heart said:

Saying things like "Dzogchen is in conflict with the teachings of sutra and tantra" is it the natural state that is intended or the teaching of Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

The latter. Sutra and tantra also aim at the state of Dzogchen whether directly or less directly. However, the teachings of Dzogchen about such things as paths, stages, cause, result and so forth in terms of Dzogchen and the other eight yānas are often incompatible and conflict with one another.

The sutra and tantra followers usual approach to this incompatibility is to chalk it up to absence of realization i.e. we are at a lower level, a causal level (whether in the true vehicle of the cause or the result vehicle approach of taking the result as the path); whereas Dzogchen is the result level, what we are aiming for.

My understanding is different. My understanding is that buddhahood is innate and exists to be demonstrated even to ordinary persons. Incidentally, this is a vastly different proposition than the tathāgatagarbha sutra position, which holds that tathāgatagarbha can only be seen by buddhas. When one's innate buddhahood is demonstrated then liberation is possible; if not, liberation is not possible.

heart said:

My friend pointed out that there seems to be a lot of flipping back and forth between Dzogchen as a teaching and as the natural state in this thread and that this therefore might be making unnecessary confusion for people and perhaps creating difficulties in the discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, that is a good observation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

Chandrakirti, Prasanapada

[Valid cognitions and valid objects] are established through mutual dependence . When valid cognitions exist, then there are things that are objects of comprehension. When there are things that are objects of comprehension then they are valid cognitions. However neither valid cognitions nor objects of comprehension exist essentially

Malcolm wrote:

The point the Vigravahavyavartani makes is that they cannot be mutually established. If a pramāṇa is a pramāṇa, it does not need a prameya; and vice versa.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Bliss, Dzogchen practice and physiology

Content:

Paul said:

Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche say, interestingly:

Now we are entering the realm of Ati yoga, where we discover that actually the fundamental state of our being is our physical body - our existence as body

Malcolm wrote:

This is perfectly in line with what I have said all along for many years. Let those who have ears, listen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

All organisations rely on collaboration whether voluntary, enforced or rewarded. It's a moot point.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such a thing as enforced collaboration. But in general the point of view is that everyone, including ChNN, etc., in the community is equal. No one is higher than anyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

It is exactly the same for the Guru Yoga which is transmitted by ChNN Rinpoche. Rinpoche has explained clearly a few times that Jesus Christ cannot be included in our Guru Yoga when he was asked by some of his students. The reasons are the same like the ones you are referring here, kalden yungdrung. So, I guess, Mohammed neither....

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I had also mentioned this fact earlier in this very thread. I really do not recall anyone suggesting we can use Jesus or some other teacher who has no connection with the Dzogchen lineage in an Anu or Mahahyoga style guru yoga. There is no basis for it.

Dronma said:

I am glad that we agree.

But Sönam claimed a few posts ago:

Sönam said:

Even non Buddhists masters ...

Sönam

Dronma said:

Like whom for example???

I need some specific names and not abstract personal guesswork.

Then, we can ask Rinpoche himself....

Malcolm wrote:

What Sonam means is that when we do Guru Yoga we can unify all knowledge and masters into Guru Yoga including the knowledge we might have learned from non-Buddhist masters. This is quite different from saying we can use non-Buddhist masters for Dzogchen Guru Yoga. The point is that non-buddhist traditions are included in the first Yāna i.e. the vehicle of gods and humans. That is all Sonam means. The point, as I have understood it since 1992, is that one unifies all knowledge into the state of Guru Yoga.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

It is exactly the same for the Guru Yoga which is transmitted by ChNN Rinpoche. Rinpoche has explained clearly a few times that Jesus Christ cannot be included in our Guru Yoga when he was asked by some of his students. The reasons are the same like the ones you are referring here, kalden yungdrung. So, I guess, Mohammed neither....

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I had also mentioned this fact earlier in this very thread. I really do not recall anyone suggesting we can use Jesus or some other teacher who has no connection with the Dzogchen lineage in an Anu or Mahahyoga style guru yoga. There is no basis for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So let's just cut the bs about DC not being a (Tibetan styled) institution. I mean really.

Malcolm wrote:

You are inferring from the fact that ChNN and Khyentse Yeshe are tulkus that Dzogchen Community is a traditional institution? A Tibetan styled one?

That is a pretty thin inference, Greg, even you can see that, I hope.

Sometime you should buy a copy of this book:

THE DZOGCHEN COMMUNITY: PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES.

It establishes the DC as a society based on the principles of mutual respect and collaboration between practitioners with a common aim. That is the key word "Collaboration". You can read about ChNN's vision of the Dzogchen Community in The Song of the Vajra, ppg. 105-114.

So someone like you, who may appreciate ChNN and his teachings, has your own commitments and your own path. You have no real idea about the internal life of Dzogchen Community and our values.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Sönam said:

Hello Greg ... can you give your sources

gregkavarnos said:

<http://khyentseyeshe.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://tsegyalgar.org/theteachers/namkhainorbu/> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Beleave what you will.

gregkavarnos said:

I believe what I can very clearly see.

Malcolm wrote:

In my opinion, you see what you beleive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So let's just cut the bs about DC not being a (Tibetan styled) institution.

treehuggingoctopus said:

It's NOT a Tibetan-styled institution. Not like it, either - at least I know no Tibetan institutions comparable to the DC. Judging what it is on the basis of info leaflets, adverts or wiki entries will not do, btw. Join it - or talk to those who've done so - and you'll understand.

It really is an autarky, with all the (numerous) pros and (not so numerous, but by no means scant) cons autarkies entail. And no, ChNNR is not its hidden puppet-master. In no way he is.

Malcolm wrote:

You're wasting your breath. Let those who live in institutional Buddhism keep their institutions. It is not our job to condition anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 28th, 2012 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It does not support a feudal elite.

gregkavarnos said:

Well not a political feudal elite but definitely a spiritual one...

Malcolm wrote:

Believe what you will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 1:08 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

here you go...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 1:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I am not putting words in his mouth.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually you are. You just did. And it proves that you are not reading what I am saying dispassionately. You have a grudge. Perhaps it is time you put me on ignore.

M

Adamantine said:

Malcolm, if I didn't directly quote you in one response it's because I was attempting to distill your sentiments from 10 different posts of yours into one line, to save time and space. If you feel misrepresented I apologize but it's really the gist of what I got from some of your statements.. Things you said I think are problematic.

I don't have a grudge against you. I more often agree with you than not, I appreciate your presence here and I like you, having spent time with you. I have no gripe with you. I was just disagreeing with things you have communicated and the way you've communicated them. You also make many claims which I don't think stand up to common sense, or scrutiny. So if my disagreeing or questioning you on this pisses you off, sorry, but then don't be so overly opinionated on a public forum.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't mind disagreement, I do mind when someone distorts what I am saying. The comparisons with Batchelor, the Trimondi's and so on, are very unhelpful exercises in polemical rhetoric. I am a very plain-spoken person, and I never distort what other people say. I just flat out disagree with them and then tell them why.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

Many dharma centers subsist on fledgeling budgets barely making ends meet. I just don't see all the financial corruptions.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever made you think I was talking about the pathetic Dharma center scene in the US? Though one reason it is pretty sad is that when Lama tours come through everyone goes broke trying to host them and money sure does not stay in the Dharma centers.

LunaRoja said:

Actually the point that I was trying to make is that there are other Lamas like ChNN that do not live off of donations and visiting Lamas that do not walk away with large sums of money.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are some.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

Many dharma centers subsist on fledgeling budgets barely making ends meet. I just don't see all the financial corruptions.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever made you think I was talking about the pathetic Dharma center scene in the US? Though one reason it is pretty sad is that when Lama tours come through everyone goes broke trying to host them and money sure does not stay in the Dharma centers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

That's not what you meant? Then clarify, because I was not trying to misrepresent you, that's clearly how I read it based on your choice of words and sentence structure.

Malcolm wrote:

You could have asked me what I meant. Instead you chose to read into it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Listen, I don't disagree with many of your critiques of Tibetan Buddhist institutional politics. I think there are many problems with institutions in general, not only monastic or political ones. I am aware of many problems in Tibetan politics both historically and currently.

However, I separate that from my experience, because my experience, ---and it has been extensive--- has been wholly positive.

Malcolm wrote:

You are lucky you are not an attractive woman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sherlock said:

...if anyone reaches SMS Level 9...

Bhusuku said:

I'm curious about that. I mean, AFAIK, until today no one, not even the oldest students who are practicing since almost 40 years passed beyond level 4 or 5, hence I'm wondering how big the chances are that anybody ever is going to reach level 9...

BTW, is Khyentse Yeshe actually participating in the SMS program? I ask, because he doesn't show up in the lists of SMS instructors...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I am becoming a little tired of seeing you distort what Malcom says, Adamantine.

I don't know if you aren't really understanding him or if you are distorting what he says on purpose by reasons unknown to me, but nevertheless it's becoming annoying already. Can you stop? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

He is just pissed because I am tired of the hierarchical bullshit that is so integral to Tibetan Buddhism and am open about it. He is mad because I have over the years made it absolutely clear that I disdain the tulku system as a mere money game, and so on. He is mad because I don't respect the system -- and I don't. Of course, lotuses grow in swamps, and likewise, there are mavelous persons who have come out of that system, or rather, despite it. I also don't share the sort of lame "anti-science" rhetoric he is into dereived in large part from the late Thrinly Norbu Rinpoche. He brought it up earlier in this thread and it is never far from his lips in these discussions. Now, I understand why he is into it, since TNR is one his gurus, but I don't find it TNR's arguments very compelling at all, and I am far from a "new athiest" of the Dawkins and Harris variety. Indeed, recently, Adamantine compared me with Batchelor, as if I had abandoned the notion of rebirth. So he is clearly approaching me from some ideological bent that I honestly can't relate to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I am not putting words in his mouth.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually you are. You just did. And it proves that you are not reading what I am saying dispassionately. You have a grudge. Perhaps it is time you put me on ignore.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:25 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

This sentence structure I am not saying that there are no good monks, nuns, lamas, khenpos and tulkus, clearly indicates that good monks, nuns, lamas, khenpos and Tulkus would be the rare exception, not the rule.

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you for telling me what I mean. Honestly-- the amazing thing to me is how you and others go out of your way to misrepresent what I say. I never do that you or anyone else.

It is quite dishonest -- you sound like Fox News.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He decided to take responsibility. It is from his side. Actually, both Yeshe and his sister, Yuden, are ChNN's lineage holders.

Adamantine said:

Then it's exactly the same social structure as any
Nyingma dynasty where a powerful lama
enthrones one or both of his offspring to hold the lineage.

Why not one of his Western students instead?

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, ChNN has never publically declared anything, AFAIK. I just happen to know
this is fact i.e that Yuden and Yeshe are his lineage holders. ChNN is 100 percent
convinced that Yeshe is the reincarnation of his uncle.

As far as his western students go, well, there are SMS teachers. And in fact he has
placed Fabio and Laura Evangelisa 100 percent in charge of Yantra Yoga. He has
actually placed a number of people in places of great responsibility.

Adamantine said:

Your theories that the DC is so radically different don't
hold up to scrutiny.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure they do. You just don't to see it because you have an personal axe to grind with me
based in your Nyingmapa conservatism.

Adamantine said:

It seems the more traditional "Buddhist" Chagdud Tulku
was much more modern and liberal in this regard: his Dzogchen
lineage holder and most of his tantric lineage holders he left to run
his scene were mostly if not all Westerners he trained. Not his
own Tibetan flesh-and-blood, as with ChNn

Malcolm wrote:

Different teacher, different group of students, different situation.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

You imply most followers of the lineages of Buddhas
are sexual predators, greedy manipulators or power hungry
deadbeats. It seems especially in regards to Tibetan Buddhism
you feel everyone is complicit in a hierarchical conspiracy

of control and deceit.

Malcolm wrote:

As for the first statement, that is an unreal misattribution. I never implied anything of the sort. However, since you bring it up, I have heard or met a number of Lamas here in the west that precisely fit the descriptions you have provided. I never said they were the majority. But it only takes a few bad apples...

As for the second, I guess you just have no idea. I guess I have known people involved with Tibetan religious politics a little more closely than you. It is every bit as nasty and corrupt and widespread as I have painted it.

I have seen first hand the incredibly nasty politics that infect every lineage of Tibetan Buddhism. Anyone who denies these things just has their head in the sand.

Adamantine said:

You are starting to sound like the Trimondis.

Malcolm wrote:

They have no idea what they are talking about. They are attacking Vajrayāna teachings out of pure malice and misunderstanding. I have not done that. What I am saying is an honest critique of a system that is badly in need of modernization and reform if it is to adapt to the modern world.

Adamantine said:

You don't need to tear apart something that is much vaster and less homogenous than you disingenuously pretend.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to study more history of Tibetan Buddhism.

For example, Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje told me never to go to Dharamsala because it was filled with evil people. He was beaten within an inch of his life for no reason on Losar in the mid 80's.

The good things about Tibetan culture and the Dharma do not cancel out the negative side of Tibetan religious politics. We spend a lot of time being involved in Tibetan internecine conflicts we are completely unaware of. I have heard Nyingma students proclaim "If your view of emptiness is Gelug, you will never be able to practice Dzogchen...." oblivious to the fact that both Shabkar and Jigme Lingpa favored Tsongkhapa's view of Madhyamaka. It just goes on and on. There is a certain bliss in ignorance, but I am too knowledgeable about controversy and issues in Tibetan Buddhism to be blind to the fact that they form a certain patterns.

The strongest critics of Tibetan culture are Tibetans themselves, people like Milarepa, Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen, Drukpa Kunly, Patrul and others who were not blind to the

problems of the institutional culture of Tibetan Buddhism. Of course, if they say things, they are heralded as great saints, but if I make the same observations I am accused of being a Trimondi. Honestly, what nonsense.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

I hope you will permit me a contrarian view.

Malcolm wrote:

How dare you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 10:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I think ChNN is great, and I think what he is doing is great. And I think it does him a disservice

to attack Buddhists, including other Dzogchen teachers in his name...

Malcolm wrote:

I did not do that. Your flights of rhetoric merely serve to make things less clear.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Thoughts on Tegal for newcomers

Content:

Sherlock said:

Looks like you're right Malcolm. Unless he schedules it at the end of next year or in 2014. He's not even coming to my country next year.

Malcolm wrote:

He has said many times that klong sde is sufficient for total realization - also with klong sde you work with the four visions. He is giving klong sde twice this year.

Pema Rigdzin said:

When is he giving Longde next (after the current retreat)?

Also, I was able to receive the donwang the other night but have only been able to catch bits and pieces of the actual instructions for Longde. If I wish to implement Longde, would it be considered insufficient to do so on the basis of going back and listening to the replays? In other words, would I need to catch the next retreat and hear the specific Longde instructions live?

Malcolm wrote:

You can listen to replays.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is an autarchy. It is self-governed. All practitioners are equal. We all have the same state. We are working toward the same goal. Some of us are further along, like ChNN, some of us are not, like me. But in the DC all practitioners are equal, we all have the same state.

Adamantine said:

It's great that you can idealize things like this, but I don't see that. If it was truly an autarchy and not an oligarchy then why would ChNN's son Yeshe need to be preened as the one to take over?

Malcolm wrote:

He decided to take responsibility. It is from his side. Actually, both Yeshe and his sister, Yuden, are ChNN's lineage holders.

But no one is in "charge" so to speak --every gar is autonomous.

Adamantine said:

I am having a hard time interpreting you curt remarks.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

M

Mariusz said:

He failed to recognize Rigpa

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Simply it is very difficult to concilate thesw 2 facts: Less realized master on one hand and the Spreading of real dozgchen on the other hand, instead of a fake misleading dzogchen taught by not realized master

I guess I just have more confidence in people than you do.

Positive thought is fine if you speak about master like Antony Robbins, but you have not answered to my previous consideration I quote above

I have not heard about many Rainbow around, after HH Dudjom rinpoche, when according to CNNR stories in Tibet there where many rainbow bodies between Dzogchen masters?

So Malcon, tell me please how you can conciliate Less realized master as the time goes by on one hand and the Spreading of real dzogchen on the other hand?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, D&G, most people who realize Dzogchen teachings fully awaken in the bardo. There are 21 capacities of practitioners. Having the ability to correctly and perfectly communicate the transmission of Dzogchen does not necessarily mean you yourself will attain phowa chenpo, or even rainbow body. But everyone who sincerely dedicates themselves to Dzogchen, having had the fortune to meet the full teachings will awaken in the bardo -- or at minimum they will spend 500 years in the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels before acheiving total realization. This is guaranteed as long as you understand the teachings. The third statement of Garab Dorje, literally translated means "continue in the confidence of liberation" -- this does not mean of course you are totally realized. It means you know the true meaning of liberation and are certain of acheiving it, so you "...continue in that state".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 6:00 AM
Title: Re: Why is a lung for mantra necessary?
Content:

LunaRoja said:
YAY we agree!

Malcolm wrote:
Well, when we exercise patience, we will almost always get to yes if we want to.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:55 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

dorje e gabbana said:
think the implication of my statement is that there will be more people who have real knowledge of Dzogchen and are able to successfully communicate this to others
I wish you will be right but it sounds a little bit like a new age thought, like the celestine prophecy, Aquarian age and a lot of stuff like that.

Malcolm wrote:
I guess I just have more confidence in people than you do.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:34 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

dorje e gabbana said:
And CNNE was very clear about the fact that without real realization Dzog Chen transmission cannot happen

Malcolm wrote:
Of course. What could you have possibly thought I meant?

dorje e gabbana said:
I wasn't referring to what you meant. Simply it is very difficult to conciliate these 2 facts:
Less realized master on one hand and the Spreading of real dzogchen on the other hand,
instead of a fake misleading dzogchen taught by not realized master

Malcolm wrote:
I think the implication of my statement is that there will be more people who have real

knowledge of Dzogchen and are able to successfully communicate this to others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

And CNNE was very clear about the fact that without real realization Dzog Chen transmission cannot happen

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. What could you have possibly thought I meant?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Malcolm, you are kidding! Isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. There are predictions to this effect in the original tantras of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

rai said:

sorry i dont really follow this thread. you are joking Malcolm, right?

i mean, you mentioned in other thread that realisation is very rare and we have seen so many great teachers passed away last years and all the great teachers we have left are getting old. so who is going to carry the transmission? or who will have the ability to spread the transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

About a Dzogchen New World Order? Of course i was kidding.

rai said:

no i mean that the Dzogchen will spread. you mentioned that we have very few realized masters alive and they are getting old so who is going to do the job?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course Dzogchen will spread, it is now spreading. I firmly believe this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Reality is found in the complete version of Buddhadharma namely like Andrew did suggest also in Sutra and Tantra.

So if Dzogchen would be spread without Sutra and Tantra would mean that everybody is fit for Dzogchen, and that is what is greatly doubted by me.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has often spoken of a time in the future on this planet when all teachings apart from Dzogchen have completely disappeared, and all people practice only Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

rai said:

sorry i don't really follow this thread. you are joking Malcolm, right?

Malcolm wrote:

About a Dzogchen New World Order? Of course i was kidding.

rai said:

i mean, you mentioned in other thread that realisation is very rare and we have seen so many great teachers passed away last years and all the great teachers we have left are getting old. so who is going to carry the transmission? or who will have the ability to spread the transmission?

can even DC survive without someone giving the transmissions? do you think Jim Valby will do?

Malcolm wrote:
It will all become clear in time.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:51 AM
Title: Re: Yeshe Tsogyal/Vajrayogini
Content:
sangyey said:
How about relationship with Tara?

Malcolm wrote:
Tsogyal is considered an emanation of Tara as well. This is why for example in the Togyal cycle in Longchen Nyinthig there is a special section for combining mantras of tara with Dechen Gyalmo pratice.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:48 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
To have a hope that the world will wake up to Dzogchen is falling into an extreme.

Malcolm wrote:
ཀླུ་པ་ཀུན་གྱི་གསང་ཆེན་མཛོད།
ཁྱ་མེད་ཚགས་ཆེན་བསྟན་པ་ནི།
རི་ལྷོ་མཁའ་ལ་ཉི་ཤར་བཞིན།
ཀླུ་ཁམས་ཡོངས་ལ་དར་ཀླས་ཤོག།

May the secret treasury of all victors,
the unsurpassed Dzogchen teachings,
spread widely through all nations
just like the sun rising in the sky.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:39 AM
Title: Re: Mipham's Shower of Blessings
Content:
yenima said:

Thanks for your answer, Adamantine, I think you're right on the dot. I'm pretty sure when we did the SoB Tsok at the temple, we did the entire practice from beginning to end, left nothing out, and I don't recall ever receiving a specific empowerment for that. I can't reach my lama right now to clarify this but I think your presentation is correct.

I'm drawn to this beautiful brief sadhana, for its use as a daily Guru Rinpoche Guru Yoga practice, with or without the Tsok, that is a lot simpler and perhaps more effective than other Guru Yogas such as Konchog Chidu, Thigle Gyachen or Pema Sangthig, for all of which I've received the empowerment, lung & commentary, in which the Guru is treated more like a yidam in a maha/atiyoga kyerim practice.

This may be particularly effective in conjunction with a study of Mipham's text "White Lotus."

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on how you practice it. There are many ways to practice Konchog Chidu. It is an anu yoga system in fact. But after it hit the Kagyus it has been treated more of a Mahāyoga system. But it isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I had the opposite experience. Two great video webcasts only with minor glitches.

Sally Gross said:

It looks as if the problems were due to my connections. Reception on my cellphone is bad in my house for some reason, and it may affect the 3G USB stick as well. Will it be possible to review the transmissions off-line? I will need to do so with these teachings, and would also like to review the two Australian retreats I followed. The first of the two Australian retreats was my first, and there was a lot I was not able to understand in that webcast or in the second Australian retreat because of my lack of knowledge. Light seems to be dawning gradually over the whole (with apologies to Wittgenstein, On Certainty, 141). None of the webcasts I have attended thus far (the two Australian retreat webcasts) are available for review in the replays section of the webcast website yet. Is there anywhere else where replays of the webcasts are available for review?

Malcolm wrote:

You can usually buy them later if you attended the webcast as best you could you can also listen to replay.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Is there any room for buddhafiels in a Dzogchen without "traditional trappings" since buddhafiels is a purely Buddhist concept and not a Dzogchen one?

Malcolm wrote:

By traditional, one should understand "Tibetan Cultural Trappings".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Perhaps you are suggesting a new tradition...

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not what I mean. But it is natural that some people might misunderstand what I mean.

What I mean is that Dzogchen in the future may be transmitted in the traditional buddhist and bon containers it has had -- but it will also be spread separately from them depending on circumstances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sally Gross said:

...

It is a lovely image, though it jars me slightly as a South African to see a globe showing on North America. I'm used to images of the globe showing at least a bit of Africa and other continents as well. What is needed is a holographic 3D rainbow sphere. Is a drop or a sphere also a thigle?

Sönam said:

I had the same thought coming from that image ... BUT my self is more use of the European view in front

this view for example

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Well good the thing the globe turns on an axis. I have no skill with 3d images so I am sorry that some of you feel left out.

The image I used was the famous Blue Pearl, the first color image of the globe taken from

space.(Oh Lord, now someone is going to accuse me of subverting Dzogchen with Siddha Yoga's blue pearl meditation)/

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

What is left here that is utopia which resembles Dzogchen new age a la 2012.

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

M

heart said:

You sound like a taliban.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Nice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/79376210@N05/7274576886/>

M

Andrew108 said:

This is scary. As Dzogchen isn't really open for criticism I hope that it doesn't become another form of control.

Sally Gross said:

A form of control is something which is imposed. How can Dzogchen be imposed? A state of awareness which cannot be achieved by striving We are talking about letting go and relaxing, about letting things be and not about some kind of global power-structure which seeks to manipulate and to control. It is a lovely image, though it jars me slightly as a South African to see a globe showing on North America. I'm used to images of the globe showing at least a bit of Africa and other continents as well. What is needed is a holographic 3D rainbow sphere. Is a drop or a sphere also a thigle?

Malcolm wrote:

Well you see, Sally, it means the New Dzogchen World Order will start in the Southwest, with the former USA as the central capital of the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Why is a lung for mantra necessary?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For this reason the first of all syllables is A.

N

LunaRoja said:

The manjushri nama samgiti also teaches that all sound comes from the short A. The shortest recitation of the prajnaparamitra is also the short A.

So it is really the basis of all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Also Hindus believe this as well. This a common idea between Buddhism and many non-dual Hindu traditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/79376210@N05/7274576886/>

M

Andrew108 said:

This is scary. As Dzogchen isn't really open for criticism I hope that it doesn't become another form of control.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, we are going to force everyone to have rainbow body whether they want it or not

Bwahahahahahahahhahahahahahahahahahahahaha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Why is a lung for mantra necessary?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds, lights and rays are the qualities of the three kāyas, not the three kāyas themselves. Kalacakra is a sambhogakāya manifestation. Shakyamuni had that realization, so he was able to communicate that concretely to those who could perceive it.

LunaRoja said:

Actually this is not what he said. He said the source of Kalachakra was from the mantra the sound.

Malcolm wrote:

Sound is a quality of dharmakāya because vibration is related to emptiness and all manifestations ultimately arise from dharmakāya. So we can say that all manifestations come from sound, and sound is possible because of emptiness. The way I understand this is that emptiness permits vibration; that vibration manifests as light, the quality of clarity; light manifests as rays, the quality of energy. For this reason the first of all syllables is A.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Why is a lung for mantra necessary?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Just found this thread:

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=4303>

I've wondered, or maybe even heard, that it could be that some Mantras were empowered by the Deity who originated them or by the Rishi who first received them, in such a way that they will work for anyone; and that other Mantras were empowered by the Deity or Rishi in such a way that they will work only for ones who have received the transmission for them. Or maybe the latter type of Mantras can still work for those who haven't received the transmission, but will be much more limited in their effect.

LunaRoja said:

Actually I think it is the opposite the deity comes from the mantra. One time when ChNN was teaching he mentioned Kalachakra. How could Kalachakra have come from Shakyamuni Buddha since Shakyamuni was a monk? He then said Kalachakra came from the mantra. For me this is why the mantras are sacred. First comes sound then rays and lights. The sacred sound is the origin of the deity as I understand it. Also it is through mantra recitation that you become the deity in deity yoga practice, sending and receiving blessings throughout the universe.

Peace,

LR

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds, lights and rays are the qualities of the three kāyas, not the three kāyas themselves. Kalachakra is a sambhogakāya manifestation. Shakyamuni had that realization, so he was able to communicate that concretely to those who could perceive it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Yeshe Tsogyal/Vajrayogini

Content:

Kelwin said:

I'm familiar with Vajrayogini from the Kagyu perspective, but how common is she in Nyingma lineages? (I am aware of the somewhat artificial dichotomy here). Are there terma practices of Vajrayogini that are used within a Nyingma and Dzogchen context?

Edit: PS I didn't mean to hijack the thread, I hope the original question is sufficiently answered by Malcolm's reply. I would however be interested to know, if there are Nyingma practices of her, in the same dancing posture, and if Yeshe Tsogyal plays a role in the Sadhanas.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayogini in various forms is a critical Anuyoga practice in many, many, cycles of teachings, beginning with the Khandro Nyinthig, which set the pattern for the rest.

Kelwin said:

I've practiced her in other forms, like Throma Nagmo, but haven't encountered her yet in the same 'Kagyu style' red form, dancing on one leg. But she will be there again then, once I dive more deeply into the Nyingthig's? That, somehow, is reassuring

Malcolm wrote:

This form is found in Khandro Nyinthig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Norwegian said:

Malcolm,

That is an awesome image.

Malcolm wrote:

I have no skill as a graphic designer, but I think it gets the message across.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 2:24 AM

Title: The Future of Dzogchen Teachings

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

What is left here that is utopia which resembles Dzogchen new age a la 2012.

Malcolm wrote:

What is left here is my conviction that Dzogchen will leave behind its traditional trappings and spread to all human beings on this planet. If you consider this utopian, fine. I consider this inevitable.

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/79376210@N05/7274576886/>

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thank you very much you finally wrote after our long forum: "it is only your belief - masters of Dzogchen will be neither buddhist nor bon"! I will remember it in the future.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said otherwise. But I am glad you feel you have wrung such an important admission out of me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

By the way, earlier in this thread Malcolm claimed that Madhyamakas reject logic. I challenged that assertion and asked for citations. None were provided.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not true -- I provided you with the reference for the Vighavyavartani and suggested you read it. There is a very readable translation by E.H Johnston.

Candra rejects pramāṇa when it comes to emptiness, accepting consequences as sufficient to show emptiness. He does not reject pramāṇa in every case, however, when he accepts that we can infer first stage bodhisattas through their compassionate deeds.

When I said Madyamakas reject "logic", I meant that they reject pramāṇa as being a meaningful path to ultimate truth. That is all I meant. Pramāṇa is a useful worldly science -- but as Rongzom states in his Introduction To The Principles of Mahāyāna (which I have incidentally translated completely, but it is unedited), "If one could reach the ends of objects of knowledge with a single flawless reasoning, for what reason was it not demonstrated in all the transmissions of the victors to begin with?"

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sherlock said:

So night practice was how Rinpoche did most of his practices including togal while he was a professor?

Malcolm wrote:

I think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

But ChNN is completely self sufficient. He does not need to raise money for himself.

This is true, He is a retired Professor who taught many yrs in the Eastern University of Naples, in Italy, and he has always lived in simple but decent conditions without using his student money

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is no class of indigent mendicants who have an excuse not support themselves in the DC. This alone makes it a very different proposition. I know a Lama who won't visit India, at least not where there are any monasteries because if he feels required to bring a minimum of \$10,000 merely to make tea offerings.

I mean, fine, this is Tibetan culture, and I am not judging Tibetan culture on its own merits. But this is completely at odds with Western culture.

But the above is not, as far as I can tell, what the Buddha intended for his Sangha of monks. Heck, one of the reasons Ashoka cracked down on the Bhikṣu Sangha and purged tens of thousands of monks from the ranks of bhikṣus is that within 150 years the Bhikṣu Sangha had become a haven for all kinds of negative people.

Poor Langdarma was murdered because he wanted to tax the monasteries, so the revisionists who rewrote the history of Imperial era cast him as a Dharma destroyer. Actually, a better read is that he saw the monasteries as an economic drain on the people and wanted to rein it in. For that he was murdered even though he was a Buddhist and wrote Buddhist texts, as the Tunhuang documents prove.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Yeshe Tsogyal/Vajrayogini

Content:

Kelwin said:

I'm familiar with Vajrayogini from the Kagyu perspective, but how common is she in Nyingma lineages? (I am aware of the somewhat artificial dichotomy here).

Are there terma practices of Vajrayogini that are used within a Nyingma and Dzogchen context?

Edit: PS I didn't mean to hijack the thread, I hope the original question is sufficiently

answered by Malcolm's reply. I would however be interested to know, if there are Nyingma practices of her, in the same dancing posture, and if Yeshe Tsogyal plays a role in the Sadhanas.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayogini in various forms is a critical Anuyoga practice in many, many, cycles of teachings, beginning with the Khandro Nyinthing, which set the pattern for the rest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It does not support a feudal elite.

Josef said:

I think this is a key point. And it illustrates a huge problem with how Tibetan Buddhist structures function in the west.

We are often treated at best as placeholders for the teachings until the next generation of Tibetans come of age and at worst we are expected to be serfs with American dollars and a good exchange rate.

When Tibetan teachers are busted sexually abusing or ripping off their American students its called crazy wisdom or they just get a free pass. When an American teacher does this kind of thing they are excommunicated and publicly ruined and turned into an example of how "we arent ready" to be real holders of the lineage. Its feudalism and racism, nothing more.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and when Someone Rinpoche and Tulku So and So gets into trouble, the putative hierarchies in Tibetan Buddhism act with complete impotence, because Someone Rinpoche and Tulku So and So are "recognized" to be some enlightened yogin, and it is all such total intolerable bullshit.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All that matters is that one's lineage is valid. If someone takes Dzogchen teachings from ChNN -- he never insists that you must adopt Buddhism as your religion. I am very sure now that Dzogchen has burst out of the Tibetan culture sphere, there will indeed be dzogchen masters who are neither buddhist nor bon.

Andrew108 said:

Hi Malcolm - what has ChNN said about the two accumulations and Dzogchen? I'm wondering particularly about accumulation of merit. As you know there are contrived practices within Tibetan Buddhism for the accumulations. How does this work in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, as I understand it, the two accumulations have always been complete.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

I regard Thurman's call for a rule of Buddhist philosopher kings a farce -- it completely failed in Tibet, from the beginning. Since it failed there, it will not succeed here.

I agree

Malcolm wrote:

Good we can agree on something.

dorje e gabbana said:

But I have seen that Tibetan Buddhist institutions run on cash. It is all about the money. It is the same also for DC. DC asks for membership card you pay cash, if you attend a DC retreat you pay cash. What is the difference between DC and other Tibetan Buddhist Institution regarding this point? please explain

Malcolm wrote:

It does not support a feudal elite.

dorje e gabbana said:

Everytime Lamas come here they are putting out the plate for donations. CNNR do the same. in 20yrs I have never seen not even one Namkhai Norbu retreat ending without Rinpoche lead a lottery where you pay cash, they raise money and people around selling you lottery ticket. Don't tell me please that lottery is a primary Dzog chen practice, neither a secondary practice.....

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, Rinpoche gives %100 of money to the Gar for its various projects. Like a good gardener, he turns the crop right back into the soil, he leaves it right where it is to keep that that garden growing and rich.

One of his strict personal samayas is to never accept money for Dzogchen teachings, to use it as means of fame, etc.

But in general, Tibetan Buddhism uses the West as a wealth pump (so do Hindus, etc., just to make sure that people understand that I am not being selective). Now, I have no problem with this when Lamas are completely up front about it like Kunzang Dechen Lingpa ("I never came here to teach, only to raise money, but then I found out there were some interested people, so I am teaching Dzogchen to those of you who are interested"). People are free to do with their money what they like. But one thing I particularly don't like is Lamas who use the name "Dzogchen" to support themselves.

dorje e gabbana said:

I am not saying it is bad from CNNR, but asking for money in DC it is non dissimilar to other Tibetan buddhist Insitution.

BTW CNNR has been accepting donations troughout the yrs for his projects from his students exatly like other tibetna buddist lamas has done and I do not see the difference.

I

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, sure, if people want to donate money to this or that project, there is no problem.

But ChNN is completely self sufficient. He does not need to raise money for himself. He had a regular job his whole life. He did not spend his life living on the donations given to monasteries. In that he is a completely different.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 27th, 2012 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

I don't know why Dzogchen is from buddhist teachers. But it is merely the fact these days. In that way as flower is called a flower, but you can see and smell it.

Malcolm wrote:

All that matters is that one's lineage is valid. If someone takes Dzogchen teachings from ChNN -- he never insists that you must adopt Buddhism as your religion. I am very sure now that Dzogchen has burst out of the Tibetan culture sphere, there will indeed be dzogchen masters who are neither buddhist nor bon.

M

Mariusz said:

You meant, you are an oracle? Padmasambhava mentioned it but He didn't say it will be not from buddhists, as I know?

Malcolm wrote:

It is what I believe, and what is predicted by ChNN. Eventually, according to him, all will practice Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

I don't know why Dzogchen is from buddhist teachers. But it is merely the fact these days. In that way as flower is called a flower, but you can see and smell it.

Malcolm wrote:

All that matters is that one's lineage is valid. If someone takes Dzogchen teachings from ChNN -- he never insists that you must adopt Buddhism as your religion. I am very sure now that Dzogchen has burst out of the Tibetan culture sphere, there will indeed be dzogchen masters who are neither buddhist nor bon.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

How can they find Dzogchen teachers then if otherwise?

Malcolm wrote:

They simply find someone who is teaching the practice of Dzogchen. Not so hard.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

You can said it even with Dzogchen: "dzogchen is not Dzogchen, People label it a "Dzogchen", but they need that comfort from a "nominally buddhists" who can teach it

completely these days. Is it not true?

Malcolm wrote:

We call potters "potters" because they make pots. We called drivers "drivers" because they drive vehicles. We call practitioners "practitioners" because they practice. We call Dzogchen practitioners "Dzogchen practitioners" because they practice Dzogchen.

It is pretty straight-foward, I don't see where your confusion lies. I don't see what useful benefit your attachment to the label "Buddhism" for Dzogchen is. Of what benefit is it to insist that Dzogchen must be part of the religion called Buddhism? Please explain this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Magnus, maybe it is simply about not limiting oneself with conceptual labels?

Malcolm wrote:

...Chogyal Namkhai Norbu ... is a nominally a Buddhist in name, because he was raised in a Buddhist culture

M

Mariusz said:

Thank you for it. You are already also "a nominally a Buddhist in name, because you was in a Buddhist culture". So the question was not about you, not also about Rinpoche. I will wait if someone who is not "a nominally a Buddhist in name because not in a Buddhist culture" will realize 4 visions completely and if really will establish the new Dzogchen lineage these days. I will agree then with you and I will be very happy of course about the "someone" who can teach Dzogchen completely. Ok?

Malcolm wrote:

Mariusz -- I am not a "Buddhist". I am a Dzogchen practitioner. I have no complaints about Dharma, but I have many complaints about "Buddhism" (and Hinduism, etc. -- just so you don't think I am leaving anyone out).

People label me a "Buddhist" because that is the box that makes people comfortable. I used to lable myself a Buddhist because it made me comfortable. I don't need that comfort anymore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

But any so called "Buddhist" or "Nyingma" would never consider themselves really[/i] a Buddhist or a Nyingma, etc. . . because the whole point is not clinging to anything, especially to self identifications or labels...

Malcolm wrote:

I saw pages and pages and pages in this thread alone where people were furiously insisting that Dzogchen was Buddhism, etc., people strongly proclaiming their identities as Buddhists and so on -- all because a stalwart bastion of Buddhist sectarianism on the internet, a guy name Namdrol, decided to let people know he had dropped it.

Adamantine said:

The teachings just have one structured framework or another... the DC is one kind. You often say you are a member of Dzogchen Community.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, a card-carrying one. Dzogchen Community is a fraternal organization. You pay dues to belong.

Adamantine said:

It can be that certainly, but it can also be a cup that holds the sacred Dharma, just as the DC with all it's global centers and books and sangha is. Just because there are people who call themselves Buddhist who don't really understand Dharma or do any practice or who screw up or act sectarian does not degrade the many noble beings who are actually practicing Dharma and accessing their Buddha nature, at whatever capacity or yana they may be able to relate to. Same as DC. It just seems like a different conceptual framework to me, is all. But maybe we will just have to not see things eye to eye on this point.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is an autarchy. It is self-governed. All practitioners are equal. We all have the same state. We are working toward the same goal. Some of us are further along, like ChNN, some of us are not, like me. But in the DC all practitioners are equal, we all have the same state.

In my opinion, in Buddhism the insitutions have become more important than the people. Actually, it has been this way for centuries -- Buddhist Institutions have functioned to support a privileged elite in a very feudal manner. Buddhism, especially Tibetan Buddhism, is an oligarchy. Tibeian Buddhism functions based on a system of vassalage and fealty. It is actually the same in other Buddhist cultures as well. The reason for this has to do with the way Buddhism has adapted itself for the past 2300 years to various aristocracies.

I used to think that since democracy and Buddhism were not compatible, we needed to subordinate ourselves to hierarchy of monks, lamas, tulkus, etc because it was necessary for the survival of the Dharma, because they supposedly represented the work of the Dharma in the world. I no longer believe that. There is way too much corruption, greed, abuse, and lust for power, title and position in Tibetan Buddhism and in Buddhism in general. There are way too many Lamas who abuse the Dharma to control people, to control scandals, to extort money from their students, etc. This completely wrong. But I have seen that Tibetan Buddhist institutions run on cash. It is all about the money. Everytime Lamas come here they are putting out the plate for donations. Of course, they have to, because they are expected to, it is their job. But frankly, I am fatigued by it. I could go on and on about my gripes about the way Tibetan Buddhism. Perhaps I have just seen one corrupt lama too many.

I am not saying that there are no good monks, nuns, lamas, khenpos and tulkus, genuinely spiritual people who mean nothing but the best for everyone. Of course there are. Not all catholic preists are pedarests either. But I am pretty toasted on the worldly ambitions of Tibetan Buddhism.

I do not beleive that traditional Buddhism is in any way capable of addressing the problems we face in the world today. I am sure that it was never capable of addressing these issues. I regard the Shambhala vision of an enlightened society to be a total fantasy, and I regard Thurman's call for a rule of Buddhist philosopher kings a farce -- it completely failed in Tibet, from the beginning. Since it failed there, it will not succeed here.

The only way we can solve the problems we have in the word today is to put down our socio/religious/culture banners. We must be like Angulimala -- we must stop. If we human beings cannot get along as one human family, there will be no chance for Dharma let alone Buddhism, no anything -- just war, famine, sickness and death.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Sherlock said:

Does the belt absolutely have to be made traditionally or would a similar belt (say for weightlifting) be useable as long as it holds in your sides tightly?

Malcolm wrote:

You should get a Gomthag, a meditation belt.

<https://www.ligmincha.org/store/vmchk/root-category-40/category-43/view-all->

products.html " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

[http://www.tibetanspirit.com/productview.asp_Q_id_E_1514_A_catid_E_271_A_mainca
t_E_Meditation_A_subcatid_E_277_A_subcat_E_Shawls+%26+Belts](http://www.tibetanspirit.com/productview.asp_Q_id_E_1514_A_catid_E_271_A_mainca
t_E_Meditation_A_subcatid_E_277_A_subcat_E_Shawls+%26+Belts) "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts on Tegal for newcomers

Content:

Sherlock said:

Looks like you're right Malcolm. Unless he schedules it at the end of next year or in 2014.
He's not even coming to my country next year.

Malcolm wrote:

He has said many times that klong sde is sufficient for total realization - also with klong
sde you work with the four visions. He is giving klong sde twice this year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

ok, so then basically you do the postures etc until you get to the point of no doubt and
then just work on integrating it into daily life, right? So then where does the rainbow
body part fit in?

Malcolm wrote:

It comes at the end of the four visions. You also use the postures in cultivating those.

My advice, you just apply the practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Thoughts on Tegal for newcomers

Content:

Sherlock said:

ChNN will give threkchod and tegal in Tenerife right? Will he also give yangti
transmission?

Andrew108 said:

That was last year. Is he giving these practices again?

Malcolm wrote:
No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 9:01 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
...no daily practice other than a commitment to discover your real nature through
atiyoga...

gregkavarnos said:
Oh, is that all...

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, indeed, that is all. That includes a lot of things to do, however.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:59 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Fa Dao said:
I could use a little help here...Rinpoche has said that many people have attained
rainbow body by practicing Longde i.e full realization. So I thought a while back that
maybe Longde would be perfect for me as I come from a Chan background and that I
could do it for the rest of my life. Then of course during this retreat he said that you only
practice Longde until your doubts are dispelled. (Rinpoche has this knack for tearing
down ones mental constructs and leaving one floating with nothing to grasp onto, or is it
just me?)
Anyways, if I have misunderstood or whatever I could use a little help/clarification.
Thanks.

Jikan said:
I had thought he said that the postures that are part of longde practice are used only
temporarily, and that the whole of longde practice is related to the second of Garab
Dorje's three statements (no longer remaining in doubt).

I'm interested in longde for more or less the same reason as you.

Malcolm wrote:
What he is said is that you do not need to spend the rest of your life in a posture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Anyways, if I have misunderstood or whatever I could use a little help/clarification.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

You can practice klong sde for your entire life, just like many practitioners have done.

He is saying that the series of klong sde is primarily connected with not remaining in doubt, but because it includes total realization, it is also connected with continuing in that state.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Yeshe Tsogyal/Vajrayogini

Content:

sangyey said:

What is Yeshe Ysogyal's relationship to Vajrayogini?

Malcolm wrote:

Tsogyal is considered to be a nirmanakāya, Vajrayogini is considered to be the Sambhogakāya; Samantabhadri is the Dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Magnus, maybe it is simply about not limiting oneself with conceptual labels?

Malcolm wrote:

Guys -- it is really not hard to understand: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is not a Nyingmapa, though all the Nyingmapas think he is. He is not a Sakyapa, though all the Sakyapas, think he is; he is not a Drugpa Kagyu, though all the Drukpa Kagyus think he is; He is not a Bonpo, though all the Gelugpas think he is.

He is a nominally a Buddhist in name, because he was raised in a Buddhist culture and Buddhist monastery -- and no one ever said otherwise. But he has also said explicitly he is not a Buddhist, nor a Bonpo. "Buddhist", Bonpo, Hindu, Christian, etc. are cultural identification -- but Dzogchen is beyond culture.

So what is he really? A Dzogchen practitioner who has integrated the meaning of Dzogchen into his life as completely as he can.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Good point. . . hmmmnnn.. maybe it's more of a conceptual difference?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it means that Ati Gury Yoga is the center of DC practice. The center of DC practice is not the thun book. You know, every retreat ChNN's holds up the thun book and says "Some people think this is Dzogchen practice -- this is not Dzogchen practice." There used to be a book called Dzogchen Ritual Practices. A nice book, very useful. Because people misunderstood, the book was swiftly discontinued and has now been out of print for twenty years.

Theoretically can be a DC practitioner and never practice a single deity their whole life. Of course, that would be a silly limitation, because sometimes it is useful to use a method of transformation. But transformation is not Atiyoga. In atiyoga, as taught by ChNN there is nothing to transform, no vows to take, no daily practice other than a commitment to discover your real nature through atiyoga -- hence the reason working with the transmission with ati guru yoga is indispensable.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

You just don't get it, the point is that he gives "lung" for it just about every time he teach.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as a secondary practice.

heart said:

This term "secondary" is a bit confusing the way you use it since Ati Guru Yoga and Song of the Vajra is a part of every thun practice.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I used it the way ChNN uses it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Conceptual said:

In the current webcast ChNN mentioned something about breathing (on the right side for males). What is he referring to?

Malcolm wrote:

When you can win a poker game or do good in business.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 10:06 AM

Title: Re: CONFUSED

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Any thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

Part of your primordial state is thugs rje -- what could be more comforting than that?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I believe the player uses flash. Apple (famously) doesn't support Flash on iOS.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Much more, we should never discuss about direct transmission publicly

Malcolm wrote:

Corret, we should never discuss the details of various methods of transmission of direct introduction. The fact of direct introduction however may be discussed because it is widely mentioned in all kinds of publically available books by ChNN and other authors.

Dronma said:

I am sorry, Malcolm. Maybe you should listen again on what Rinpoche advised us today. He said that we should never mention that we received direct transmission even to the other Dharma teachers we might have! Much more, we should never discuss about direct transmission publicly. Nothing more to say.

Malcolm wrote:

I know very well what he was saying I have heard him say it a gazillion times. Sakyapas and Gelugpas do not accept direct introduction as an independent method (The Gelugpas negate it completely, Sakyas accept it only after one has received a major empowerment -- like ChNN I was educated in the Sakya system). Therefore, he was saying that you should not go to a Sakya or Gelug Lama and tell them that you have received direct introduction because they might negate you.

But in fact Sakya and Gelug Lamas know this perfectly well.

So, saying "Dzogchen is based on direct introduction, not tantric intitiation" is a perfectly acceptable thing to say when someone asks you "What is the difference between the method of entering Dzogchen teachings and Vajrayāna."

Just out of curiosity, just how long have you been a student of ChNN? Beyond that, you follow your conscience, I will follow mine, deal?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Much more, we should never discuss about direct transmission publicly

Malcolm wrote:

Corret, we should never discuss the details of various methods of transmission of direct introduction. The fact of direct introduction however may be discussed because it is widely mentioned in all kinds of publically available books by ChNN and other authors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Haha no arguements here, except for one, which is that I'm quite sure that The Precious Vase says that Yantra Yoga is a indispensable secondary practice.

Malcolm wrote:

It says yantra is an indispensable practice related to behavior for integrating the three gates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Secondary also does not necessarily mean not indispensable.

Of course the primary practice, Guru Yoga, is indispensable.

However it seems that there are secondary practices that are indispensable, and secondary practices that are not indispensable.

Indispensable secondary practices, in the Dzogchen Community, I believe would include Ganapuja, the Song of the Vajra, and Yantra Yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, lhug old buddy -- for DC people only Ati Guru Yoga is indispensable.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Is ganapuja also considered a secondary practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. Being "secondary" does not mean "not useful".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I note that the triple refuge is a part of the Thun's ChNNR teach.

Malcolm wrote:

The thun book is not Dzogchen, as ChNN says everytime he gives the lung from that text.

heart said:

You just don't get it, the point is that he gives "lung" for it just about every time he teach.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as a secondary practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Just received 'The Crystal and the Way of Light' today.

Very clear explanations about many things which I'm looking forward to examining more deeply, and very much consistent with advice given on other threads here with regard to : 'how to maintain commitment by applying the essentials of practice'.

I came across the drawing of Dorje Legba and, for reasons obvious to some of you, was a little taken aback until I noticed his right hand held a vajra. LOL

Malcolm wrote:

Yes,Vajrasadhu, the Dzogchen practitioner's friend.

This is the more characteristic way he presented in the DC, as a wild Masang.

Blue Garuda said:

'Masang' ?

I Googled the word and came up with local protector or a physical region of Tibet. Would 'local' or 'worldy' be correct, or another wording?

In the book the description is of a protector to be called upon for worldly and less powerful action than Rahula (not sure about using the names on an open forum).

Having only spent a couple of hours skimming the book (which I always do before I read in depth) it seems a pity that you can't just point to it online and use it to support answers about Ati Guruyoga and Direct Introduction. You see, I'm slow and pernickety and I got it (finally) so there's hope for everyone.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Dorje Legpa's job among other things, it to control the masang, just like Ejajati's job is to control mamos and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

What is your real contribution to this discussion in terms of contents, so far ? ZERO

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, and you have made a real contribution? All you have done since showing up is spread fractious contention, as well as demonstrated rudeness, arrogance and pride.

But you have not made one substantially valuable post since appearing here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

So don't go around claiming to be some great Dzogchen meditator when in fact you are nothing but a farting lout, stinking of alcohol and rank with lust

Malcolm wrote:

It would be nice if you followed this advice, and behaved a little more humbly yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

By the way it sounds strange hearing people claiming that CNNR just teaches Dzogchen as an independent vehicle.

Malcolm wrote:

What was said was that ChNN teaches that Dzogchen is an independent path; no one said he does not also teach there are other ways to approach Dzogchen.

dorje e gabbana said:

In The Santi maha sanga training you must:

complete Ngondro

Malcolm wrote:

Not in the way you imagine. But this is a first level requirement, so I am not going to discuss it.

dorje e gabbana said:

Practising tza sum, that is 3 roots: guru, deva e dakini mantra accumulating at list one bum for each one

Malcolm wrote:

Visualizing clearly the Three Roots of the Anuyoga practice - Guru (Padma Thötrengtsal), Deva (Guru Tragpo or Guru Tragphur) and Dakini (Simhamukha) - and connecting the concentration with recitation of the mantra, for each of the Three Roots:

- According to recitation based on quantity, one must do seven hundred thousand, five hundred thousand or at least three hundred thousand recitations.
- According to recitation (based on quality) with perfect visualization integrated with the reciting of the mantra (singing the melody in the case of Padma Thötrengtsal) one must dedicate at least three weeks of recitation (in retreat).

So you have a choice between time and number.

dorje e gabbana said:

So he asks people seriously committed in getting semde, londe, mennagde teachings, to practice before the standard tantric set of practice required by all Nyma masters.

Malcolm wrote:

Another misconception.

dorje e gabbana said:

And it is very very good, and also normal in a serious way to teach dzogchen, even if for some people used to get only external teaching from CNNR it seems very strange

Malcolm wrote:

SMS is not for everyone. Only for people who are interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Inge said:

Hi!

A few years ago I prematurely attended some teachings and empowerments that were given with lifetime daily practice commitments. Afterwards I struggled immensely with these practices for maybe a half year or so, but they made no sense to me, and I ended up doing them out of guilt, and fear of vajra hell. Then I gave them up altogether. Now I only try to follow the teachings of ChNN, do Guru Yoga when I remember, and other DC practices when I have time and energy, but I still fear negative consequences for abandoning past practice commitments.

LunaRoja said:

In all fairness to Inge's original question she states she does Guru Yoga when she remembers. How often does she remember; once a day, once a week, once a month, every couple of years etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

And what business is it of yours? She is asking those of us who are in the DC what our teacher thinks about such things. So we explained it, very clearly.

All you people will wind up doing -- assuming she is paying the slightest attention to you (which she ought not) -- is enhancing her anxiety. This is not useful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

conebeckham said:

Those of you with full faith and confidence in CNNR, follow his instructions. Those of you with full faith and confidence in another teacher, follow that teacher's instructions.

Malcolm wrote:
Exactly.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:32 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

samdrup said:
Thanks for your condescending reply anyway.

Malcolm wrote:
I know, and I thought I was a condescending prick...I have been bested.

heart said:
You didn't see that one coming, right?

Malcolm wrote:
Nope, right out of the goddamn blue sky.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:08 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

samdrup said:
Thanks for your condescending reply anyway.

Malcolm wrote:
I know, and I thought I was a condescending prick...I have been bested.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:06 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

Adamantine said:
Or do you read this differently Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, I read it to mean that since the goal of all teachings is Atiyoga, doing Ati Guru Yoga

sincerely actually develops all these transmissions.

People keep on bringing up this idea of a half-hearted A etc. Don't you understand that this in itself is a distracting misrepresentation? Or is it more important to you to tease out every possible defect then understand the main goddamn point?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Adamantine said:

Perhaps I did hear, and forgot. Hard to say. Although I have great respect for ChNN, and use many things he has taught me, he is not my main teacher since I feel it is important to have more access to my main teacher for questions and clarification than a moment on stage every couple years in the midst of a long line or a short email. As such, I have had many teachings which may not agree with ChNN's perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

We all have different paths. He is my main Guru. So for me, what he says matters first, then upadeshas, then tantras, etc. -- last on the list and very far down is the opinion of other Lamas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 26th, 2012 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes! For the 100th time! I have said this over and over again for years. I find it hard to beleive that anyone who has been following ChNN's teachings for years could have failed to hear him say this.

M

Adamantine said:

Perhaps I did hear, and forgot. Hard to say. Although I have great respect for ChNN, and use many things he has taught me, he is not my main teacher since I feel it is important to have more access to my main teacher for questions and clarification than a moment on stage every couple years in the midst of a long line or a short email. As such, I have had many teachings which may not agree with ChNN's perspective.

I also was a student of KDL, could you clarify what he said regarding Guru Yoga fulfilling commitments? Which guru yoga was he referring to, any one, or a specific terma of his own?

Malcolm wrote:

He was referring to himself. Mere devotion to him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Dzog chen and white A GY are far beyond intellectual understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh I get it now -- you really deeply understand Dzogchen teachings and Ati Guru Yoga much better than anyone here on Dharmawheel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

I think DC practioners are intelligent people and not 7 years old children like you seem to think.

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not since you insult their intelligence at every turn and tell them that what they have heard that have not heard, what they have seen, they have not seen. It is actually you who are insisting that DC people are children, and not the other way around.

Anyway:

"First of all, when you take a a Tantric Initiation, you're given a water to drink. And this is called the water of one's vows, of one's promises. When you drink that water you've taken a kind of oath. You've sworn to follow that which you are about to commit yourself to. Many people do not know all this and collect hundreds of of different initiations. If one does this and then does nothing about these commitments, far from having done yourself good, what you have done is created obstacles and impediments for yourself.

What do you have to do? You have to maintain the transmission. If you're a practitioner of Dzogchen and understand the principle involved, and you don't remain in some boxed-in limited conditions, you can for all of these commitments made carry them to the level of Guruyoga. Whatever transmissions you have received, you can take them to the level of their unification, and at that level practice the Guruyoga. In such a case it all

becomes positive. That is to say, you're acting to deepen and develop all these transmissions you have received.

You have to remember that this is the way of seeing of a Dzogchen practitioner. If one lives limited and boxed in to some level of teaching, then that's not the case for you. But you have to therefore understand and see through the limits of the traditions and systems.

Talks in OZ, 1982 ppg 171-172

As far as I can tell, you are very interested in keeping people in boxes of your own contrivance.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Pero said:

Perhaps you should learn something from them.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, it is amazing -- answer a simple question and the Buddhist Sanhedrin gets all up in arms. Seven pages of pointless perseverance about poor Inge's personal business.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

I think CNNR's teaching about the way to integrate all samaya through Guruyoga is very precious. But GY according to him is synonymous of rigpa because he is a dzogchen master and not a tantric master.

Well, many people are satisfied with general answers and don't dig in to the problem because they are not aware of all the implications or just to cut the story short not to feel guilty conscience

Try to ask CNNR instead very directly if the samaya are kept even if you are not in the rigpa state and just sound A, using your mind and not abiding in the nature of mind..

Malcolm wrote:

As long as you are not indifferent, and are trying your best, then there is no problem, as I said -- a statement you rejected.

dorje e gabbana said:

The way to integrate all lineage and samaya in the "White A guru yoga" does not mean that everything is OK if you practice GY only following a dzog chen style, rather the real issue is to be really in dzog chen state of natural mind, and if you are or not in that rigpa state while doing A.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as you are trying your best, there is no problem.

dorje e gabbana said:

Unfortunately many people is not very interested in understanding if they really recognize what you supposed to recognize in Dzog chen. T

They are just satisfied sounding A and everything is really wonderful

Malcolm wrote:

Another misrepresentation. The question was "Can Ati Guru Yoga received from ChNN maintain your commitments to previously taken tantric practice commitments, etc." The answer, for those people who do not have wax in their ears and cobwebs in their eyes, YES!

Ati Guru Yoga is not just a method of maintaining commitments, no one said that it was. It is a method of discovering your instant presence, a supreme method, more important than many others. If you need help, more assistance, then you add Song of the Vajra. The point is not to remain complacent -- and if you think that is what I was saying you really are very wrong.

I don't even know who you are or if ChNN is your main teacher or what. But if he is, I am amazed that you do not understand the principle here. If not, then I can understand why you are out of step with our understanding.

Still, you should know better than to sow doubts in people's minds when they ask honest questions. This person, Inge said she could not relate to the practice she had received. She wanted to know a simple answer. She received it according to the principles that ChNN has been enunciating for years. If you are following his teaching, you should integrate all your transmissions and teachings into Guru Yoga of one of three styles, Ati, Anu, or Mahā -- your choice. That's it -- it is really simple. No one was advocating complacency or indifference to samaya or anything else -- so it is egregious that you, gabbana, have created such a misrepresentation.

If people are offended because I said she did not have to go back to her former teacher and "give back" her practice commitment -- tough. Too goddamn bad. It is not necessary.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Just received 'The Crystal and the Way of Light' today.

Very clear explanations about many things which I'm looking forward to examining more deeply, and very much consistent with advice given on other threads here with regard to : 'how to maintain commitment by applying the essentials of practice'.

I came across the drawing of Dorje Legba and, for reasons obvious to some of you, was a little taken aback until I noticed his right hand held a vajra. LOL

Malcolm wrote:

Yes,Vajrasadhu, the Dzogchen practitioner's friend.

This is the more characteristic way he presented in the DC, as a wild Masang.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

If it based on anything, it is based on income, since to purchase 100% organic you have to be fairly economically privileged.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, you just have to be willing to cook.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Your behaviour about this subject is really strange. I do not intend coming back on it

Malcolm wrote:

Fine, you are not Pizza.

From my point of view, your behavior is strange. And it is good that you give this up.

I know very well, from long experience of many people including myself, that if she wrote an email to ChNN and asked him, he would tell her not to worry and to just continue to do Guru Yoga -- I have seen many personal emails from him to people with similar anxieties, because indeed this is a common anxiety. He always says the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Sherlock said:

Actually just yesterday he said that you can integrate teachings from other teachers, Gelugpa, Sakyapa etc with Guru Yoga but advised against telling them that because they would disagree.

Adamantine said:

Are you sure he was not talking about integrating the teachers into Guru Yoga? I don't see how you could integrate other teachings into Guru Yoga, but Rinpoche always encourages us to integrate all of our teachers while doing Guru Yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he was talking about sadhana practice daily commitments! I frankly do not see why this is hard to understand. This was also teaching of Kunzang Dechen Lingpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Adamantine said:

I don't want to split hairs here, but this is a general, and interpretable statement. Does he really intend this to mean: whatever tantric samayas you may have received from other Lamas, however profound, and despite whatever they may tell you themselves: it doesn't matter, just do the Guruyoga I teach you and drop the rest, and you don't need to worry about the rest.??

Malcolm wrote:

Yes! For the 100th time! I have said this over and over again for years. I find it hard to beleive that anyone who has been following ChNN's teachings for years could have

failed to hear him say this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Adamantine said:

I might be missing something, but I don't see ChNN's quote as contradicting Longchenpa's in any way. The way I read ChNN's quote is that in Dzogchen practice, the only samaya is to find oneself in the condition of "what is," as it is. I believe this is the Dzogchen samaya, once one has transmission for it. He does not here say, imply, or intend that if you have already taken a Mahayoga empowerment for instance, with whatever samayas that entails, that taking Dzogchen transmission relieves you of that samaya and all you need to focus on is your Dzogchen samaya. I don't see how you get that at all from this quote. Please find some textual proof, in Dzogchen tantras or ChNN's own writing or transcribed teaching where he says this. I have attended a few retreats with him in person and a bunch of webcasts and read his books and I never ever heard him say this.

Sönam said:

"...according to Dzogchen the way to keep all samayas is to do Guruyoga." ... but of course it implies that one understand what is Dzogchen. Dzogchen is not included in Vajrayana ... Vajrayana can be included in Dzogchen. ChNN call it "to integrate".

Dzogchen is not for all practitioners ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

I would revise that slightly -- ChNN's Dzogchen is not for all practitioners since people find his perspectives unsettling. Anyway, he said even just now, if you have not understood rigpa, then you do Song of the Vajra, as it says in the Nyi zla kha byor tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sönam said:

Some people are making Tune book, they say I make Dzogchen practice, it is not Dzogchen practice. Tune book is Anuyoga. Dzogchen is Guru Yoga ...

ChNN - 5/25/2012

Malcolm wrote:

Yes -- but it is not our job to condition people. Mostly, we have been pushing back because people are strongly trying to condition us. The truth is that we just need to ignore people who disagree with us about what our teacher says. We are committed to his teachings, they are not -- so their opinion is pretty irrelevant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Adamantine said:

I might be missing something, but I don't see ChNN's quote as contradicting Longchenpa's in any way. The way I read ChNN's quote is that in Dzogchen practice, the only samaya is to find oneself in the condition of "what is," as it is. I believe this is the Dzogchen samaya, once one has transmission for it. He does not here say, imply, or intend that if you have already taken a Mahayoga empowerment for instance, with whatever samayas that entails, that taking Dzogchen transmission relieves you of that samaya and all you need to focus on is your Dzogchen samaya. I don't see how you get that at all from this quote. Please find some textual proof, in Dzogchen tantras or ChNN's own writing or transcribed teaching where he says this. I have attended a few retreats with him in person and a bunch of webcasts and read his books and I never ever heard him say this.

Malcolm wrote:

From the Guruyoga book:

"...according to Dzogchen the way to keep all samayas is to do Guruyoga."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Malcom Please provide any proof that CNNR has really stated or written what you have just stated about the fact that trying do to your best even though you are not in rigpa state is enough to keep other tantric samayas.

Malcolm wrote:

Pizza, If I do not reply to your question, you can understand that I think your question is absolutley worthless because it misrepresents what I said. The same goes for Mariusz.

However, this one last time:

From the Guruyoga book:

"...according to Dzogchen the way to keep all samayas is to do Guruyoga."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

rai said:

because i cannot rest in rigpa and dont have really idea about it is but i can sound A with visualization. would that be sufficient then?

Malcolm wrote:

It means you understand that the white A and thigle in your heart unifies all your transmissions. Even if you have not yet come to confidence about what rigpa means, since you are trying your best, this is sufficient. If you want to do something more elaborate, you can do an Anu or Mahāyoga style guru yoga ala the short thun or medium thun. It is always up to you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:08 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I note he is acting like a normal Nyingma master sending his son to Tibet to be enthroned as a Tulku and set him up as his successor. What am I missing?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

well, for one, it was a Sakya monastery, the Sakya monastery ChNN's family has been associated with for centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I note that the triple refuge is a part of the Thun's ChNNR teach.

Malcolm wrote:

The thun book is not Dzogchen, as ChNN says everytime he gives the lung from that text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:02 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is not part of Nyingma. I wish people would just get used to this fact.

heart said:

Because you say so, or do you have a quote?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Because ChNN says he is not a Nyingmapa.

Also I do not belong to any school of Tibetan Buddhism. I am just a member of the DC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:54 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Now, I never met Longchenpa -- but I know ChNN, since he is my root guru. The person who asked the original question is a student of ChNN and interested in following him, I will refer that person to ChNN's POV over Longchenpa.

Sorry if you find that offensive.

LunaRoja said:

No offense. It is good to offer different POV.

Malcolm wrote:

In ChNN's case, you can consider that he has granted all of his students permission to just unify their practice in Ati Guru Yoga. I was talking to a ChNN student.

At the end of the day, one must admit that students of ChNN have a very different attitude towards these issues than Nyingmapas. So really, it is better to leave it alone.

And it is super boring to have people insist to us we have not understood our own teacher's point of view. I have been to countless retreats with ChNN and read countless books by him. But every now and again, someone comes along who is not in the DC who starts telling DC people based on Nyingma, or Kagyu, or whatever, what we are supposed to think. Just stop it.

Dzogchen Community is not part of Nyingma. I wish people would just get used to this fact.

Thanks,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:46 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Is that supposed to be Lama Drimed Norbu?

because I think he's a Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

What I heard is that Wynn Fischel got bounced from Rigdzin Ling because he started incorporating Shamanic work and so on for his students and freaked out the Buddhist conservatives. Or so I have been told by people who lived there and are close to the situation.

M

Adamantine said:

I think his name is Alwyn, and I don't know about all that.. All I know is David (in LA) who I think you must know via Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, speaks quite highly of him.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, everyone I know speaks highly of Wynn. It is also true that he started working with shamanism and energy practices from non-Buddhist sources because he thought it was useful for his students and from what I understand the Buddhist conservatives at Rigzin Ling freaked out and tossed him out on his ear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:41 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

LunaRoja said:

"When one is practicing on such a path, it is necessary to observe all the primary and secondary samayas (which are subsumed within the principles of enlightened form, speech, and mind) just as they are described. If one does not observe them, one will develop many faults, the inevitable consequences of which are weighty, and one will linger for a long time in lower states of rebirth" Longchenpa (How the Lower Approaches are Subsumed into The Higher) p.353 The Precious Treasury of Philosophical Systems

Malcolm wrote:

When one receives an initiation, for example, one promises to carry out the transformation practice daily, reciting the corresponding mantra at least three or seven times. On top of this commitment, there are also many other related samaya which must be observed. But in Dzogchen the only samaya involved is to find oneself in the condition of "what is," as it is. All the rest, that is to say all the judgments and creations of the mind, all our limits, and so on, all these are false and superfluous.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 986-989). Kindle Edition.

Now, I never met Longchenpa -- but I know ChNN, since he is my root guru. The person who asked the original question is a student of ChNN and interested in following him, I will refer that person to ChNN's POV over Longchenpa.

Sorry if you find that offensive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:19 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I also have heard of returning samaya. Thank you Dorje e gabbana!

Malcolm wrote:

No one said you cannot ask some Guru to relieve you of samaya you may have undertaken. But there is no ritual to do so. You simply ask.

It is also true that if you are a Dzogchen practioner, there is no need to return anything -- all samayas are maintained perfectly by pursuing Dzogchen practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:13 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

I have never met a stand along dzog chenpa and probably the only one in all the dzog chen history was Garab Dorje -Prahevajra

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen practitioners can make use of all and any methods they choose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:10 PM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

This is all nice, but in reality it is just so much conceptual proliferation. Commitments are connected with a path. If you decide you are not going to follow that path, then what is the point of maintaining commitments to a path one is not following? None

Malcolm Your point is very original in both vajrayana and dzogchen.

Try to explain it to dakinis and Daharmapala and Damchens when you will be in the bardo, they will probably consider your little Occam human logic even though they are everything but humans and they are not P.C. and sensitive about human rights

Malcolm wrote:

You worry about you. I will worry about me.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:51 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

These are the first sources I can give you right away. Study both of you guys better Vajrayana and you will find evidence of that

Malcolm wrote:

These are not sources. This is just hearsay. A source would be, for example, a clear statement from some tantra, etc. Since no such rite exists, however, you will not be able to provide such a source.

Adamantine said:

Maybe not in a text, but Kagyu is the "ear whispered" lineage after all Malcolm! Maybe

give the benefit of the doubt to this persons teachers. . . Tantras are coded and interpretable, which is why there is such an emphasis on oral instructions. . .

Malcolm wrote:

All Varjayāna lineages are so called snyan rgyuds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:41 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

but this is anyway the teching I received from the lama I mentioned

Malcolm wrote:

Your lama is not an authority for anyone but you. Further, this has nothing to do with Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:39 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Josef said:

Its completely unnecessary to "remove" the samayas whether or not there is a ritual to do so.

Practicing Dzogchen properly keeps all samayas.

There is no need to give anything up or give anything back.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:38 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

These are the first sources I can give you right away. Study both of you guys better Vajrayana and you will find evidence of that

Malcolm wrote:

These are not sources. This is just hearsay. A source would be, for example, a clear statement from some tantra, etc. Since no such rite exists, however, you will not be able to provide such a source.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:05 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
Is that supposed to be Lama Drimed Norbu?

because I think he's a Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:
What I heard as that Wynn Fischel got bounced from Rigdzin Ling because he started incorporating Shamanic work and so on for his students and freaked out the Buddhist conservatives. Or so I have been told by people who lived there and are close to the situation.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 11:00 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
When one receives an initiation, for example, one promises to carry out the transformation practice daily, reciting the corresponding mantra at least three or seven times. On top of this commitment, there are also many other related samaya which must be observed. But in Dzogchen the only samaya involved is to find oneself in the condition of "what is," as it is. All the rest, that is to say all the judgments and creations of the mind, all our limits, and so on, all these are false and superfluous.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 986-989). Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:49 AM
Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments
Content:

Yontan said:
There's no benefit to "worrying" about past commitments, but from our confused pov, the importance of maintaining prior commitments is not something to poo-poo and abandon. When we commit to and engage in a higher practice it encompasses the intent of the lower practice. It reminds us of the parable of the friends who made a boat

to carry them to the island of gold and then carried the boat on their heads out of respect.

If we abandon prior commitments, it robs us of the power to commit. When we commit to a higher practice, we can feed all of our resolve into it and make aspirations that all previous dharmic commitments be fulfilled in this practice, and that any failing of commitment will be mitigated by our even stronger current commitment. This keeps us from being lazy and from falling into the fault of abandoning the lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

This is all nice, but in reality it is just so much conceptual proliferation. Commitments are connected with a path. If you decide you are not going to follow that path, then what is the point of maintaining commitments to a path one is not following? None.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 10:42 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

As matter of fact in Vajrayana there are specific rituals in order to give back tantric samaya to the master who gave you...

Malcolm wrote:

Nonesense -- such a rite does not exist.

dorje e gabbana said:

For the same reasons a monk can give back his vinaya vows and come back to the layman status.

Malcolm wrote:

This only applies in Hīnayāna. There is no rite for returning a vow in Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

Perfect. But I wasn't speaking about what he said from the 90's on. What you say , Malcolm, is very well known by everybody who followed CNNR throughout the years.

Instead I was speaking about what he taught in the 70's and I tried to figure out why he changed his definition of rigpa

Malcolm wrote:

I explained, it is the difference between dran shes and shes rig i.e. aware mindfulness and knowing awareness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Pero said:

(and you shouldn't abandon your Vajra teachers in any case).

Malcolm wrote:

Unless they prove to be total dipshits and false guides.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

dorje e gabbana said:

He calls rigpa instant presence because in tregchö the essence is ma bcos shes pa skad gcig ma i.e. a moment of unfabricated awareness. ma bcos shes pa skad gcig ma is not mind, it is beyond mind, thoughts and concepts.

Yes but as I explained in the 70's he pointed out that whatever kind of presence (instant presence or presence) was not rigpa. Than he changed as he changed many other things

How long have you been known CNNR?

In any case I am just dorje e gabbana and nobody else.

Malcolm wrote:

Since 1992. Now, CHNN is very clear presence = mindfulness; instant presence = rigpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

Unknown said:

CNNR got probably used to indicate rigpa as the state of presence after meeting the Gurdjef followers in Conway Community. They gave him their own centre recognizing him as the master they were looking for many yrs who was the natural link with the gurdjef simple teachings about presence, they were used to adopt in their studies. That is my thought because CNNR did not use the word presence as synonymous with rigpa before meeting the Conway's guys.

CNNR started to use very often the equation rigpa=presence, may be because he thought it was a more understandable definition for western disciples, even though in the 70's it was very clear about the fact that Rigpa is not Presence.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, ChNN does not equate rigpa with presence. That is mindfulness.

He calls rigpa instant presence because in tregchö the essence is ma bcos shes pa skad gcig ma i.e. a moment of unfabricated awareness. ma bcos shes pa skad gcig ma is not mind, it is beyond mind, thoughts and concepts.

BTW, welcome back Dorje Pizza

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

Sönam said:

Not to forget that Namkhai Norbu itself has choose to translate rigpa by "presence".

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Sonam: ChNN translates dran pa i.e. mindfulness as presence. rig pa is translated as instant presence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Are you being deliberately obtuse? The idea of a daily practice commitment comes from lower tantra. This is not a Dzogchen principle.

LunaRoja said:

No I am not being deliberately obtuse. I wanted you to clarify your answer which I did not understand. The daily practice commitments usually come from HYT not the lower tantras. I know some Dzogchen Lamas that also give HYT empowerment's.

No need to be insulting. So far I am not in agreement with what you said. I will maintain my samaya with my Vajrayana gurus. You make your own choice.

Malcolm wrote:

The notion of daily practice commitments comes from lower tantras. In Tibet the practice of the three outer tantas has greatly influenced the way higher yoga tantras are

practiced.

Also such things as the shape of the vajra and the bell, etc. You have a mantra, you must recite this everyday. This is completely not in accordance with any principles of Dzogchen teachings. Of course they have their own principles, but there is no Dzogchen tantra anywhere that says "When you receive this empowerment, you must recite this mantra, etc...".

The question was: is a Dzogchen practitioner required to maintain previous practice commitments they might have received. The answer is you can unify all commitments into Guru Yoga, and no, you do not have to recite every mantra that came with a lifetime practice commitment because that idea is from lower tantra, which includes maha and anu.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I hope in this Dharma Wheel forum for Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhists we can celebrate and rejoice in the great fortune we have to have met the Dharma in this life.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not been debating, just teasing out more possibilities than Buddhists typically wish to allow.

But yes, of course -- Namo Shakyamunaye.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sönam said:

not only they are deaf ... but also they are blind

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they only see what they believe.

Oh well, the funny thing is I am not conditioning anyone. But Mariusz in particular is very interested in conditioning others to his point of view. Well this is his limitation, and not ours.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I fear that these type of dialogues may even produce some new examples.

Malcolm wrote:

"Fear is the mind-killer."

-- Bene Gesserit litany against fear

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen teachings are neither a philosophy, nor a religious doctrine, nor a cultural tradition. Understanding the message of the teachings means discovering one's own true condition, stripped of all the self-deceptions and falsifications which the mind creates. 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.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 123-125). Kindle Edition.

For example, those who already have a certain familiarity with Tibetan culture might think that to practice Dzogchen you have to convert to either Buddhism or Bon, because Dzogchen has been spread through these two religious traditions. This shows how limited our way of thinking is. If we decide to follow a spiritual teaching, we are convinced that it is necessary for us to change something, such as our way of dressing, of eating, of behaving, and so on. But Dzogchen does not ask one to adhere to any religious doctrine or to enter a monastic order, or to blindly accept the teachings and become a "Dzogchenist." All of these things can, in fact, create serious obstacles to true knowledge.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 161-166). Kindle Edition.

The principle in Dzogchen is to avoid creating anything false, and to really understand the reasons for what one is doing. It is not important to define oneself as belonging to

this or that school, tradition, or point of view, and it makes no difference whether one considers oneself to be Buddhist or not. Basically, feeling oneself to be a follower of something or other is just a limit, and what one really needs is to understand one's own condition and to open oneself, getting rid of all these kinds of barriers.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 1048-1051). Kindle Edition.

For a practitioner of Dzogchen, even to call oneself "nonsectarian" is just another way of taking a position of one's own in relation to the position of someone else, which is irrelevant, because the truth is that any definition of this kind at all is an unnecessary limitation.

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State (Kindle Locations 1054-1055). Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Have you found this master in non-Buddhism or non-Bon now in the world? Simply answer please.

Malcolm wrote:

I already answered this question.

Mariusz said:

Please repeat, I didn't read it.

Malcolm wrote:

Read my posts. I am not here merely to answer your obsessive questions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

So are you finally agree Buddhism or Bon is necessary for complete transmission of Dzogchen now, including realization of 4 visions? I,ve questioned you it here.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither Buddhism nor Bon are necessary for a complete transmission of Dzogchen. All that is necessary is a Dzogchen master.

M

kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Is it for that so called Dzogchen Master important to partake or not within the Buddhist
Dzogchen Lineages and Masters?

Mutsog Marro
KY

Malcolm wrote:
What do you mean by partake?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:20 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Mariusz said:
So are you finally agree Buddhism or Bon is necessary for complete transmission of
Dzogchen now, including realization of 4 visions? I,ve questioned you it here.

Malcolm wrote:
Neither Buddhism nor Bon are necessary for a complete transmission of Dzogchen. All
that is necessary is a Dzogchen master.

M

Mariusz said:
Have you found this master in non-Buddhism or non-Bon now in the world? It is
necessary or not? Simply answer please.

Malcolm wrote:
I already answered this question.

I will say "My master was educated a Buddhist."

You will say Aha! So Dzogchen must be Buddhist! (or Bon).

I will say, no, Dzogchen is beyond that.

You are merely chasing your tail.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Ok, it is a Buddhist belief with a couple noted exceptions. This doesn't really change the point. Unless you are arguing that some Hindus and followers of a relatively extinct version of Christianity can practice Dzogchen without contradiction, but not everyone else?

Malcolm wrote:

It is also a modern finding consistent with Quantum physics of various strands, and so on -- there are all kinds of people and people who do not think that world is "real" per se.

People who think the world is real generally do not seek out Eastern spiritual traditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who said anything about erase? One's commitment is to discover one's primordial state. As long as that remains your focus, there is no problem at all.

M

LunaRoja said:

To clarify my question a Lama who may or may not be a Dzogchen master gives a student an empowerment and states the samaya is to do the sadhana for the rest of one's life. The student decides to focus on discovering their primordial state instead of doing the sadhana. How does this fulfill their commitment?

Malcolm wrote:

Are you being deliberately obtuse? The idea of a daily practice commitment comes from lower tantra. This is not a Dzogchen principle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Is it OK to post such long excerpts from restricted books (if they're not explaining the practices itself)?

Malcolm wrote:

that is on the web for anyone to read.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

dupe

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

So are you finally agree Buddhism or Bon is necessary for complete transmission of Dzogchen now, including realization of 4 visions? I,ve questioned you it here.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither Buddhism nor Bon are necessary for a complete transmission of Dzogchen. All that is necessary is a Dzogchen master.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

...experiences of realms are just as real as our experience of our human realm.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is to say they are not real at all.

Adamantine said:

That is a Buddhist belief.

Malcolm wrote:

Well no it isn't. It is a commonly shared perspective all across the spectrum of Indian religions. It is also present in Christianity vix platonism, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Again, how is anyone from another tradition (most other traditions have elements of Eternalism), or a scientific-materialist/empiricist going to agree with this? Let alone be able to practice a tradition based on this view? I understand that people from other traditions can be exposed to Dzogchen teachings, and even begin practicing them.. but at a certain point, they are going to have to choose one view or another.

Malcolm wrote:

The only "view" they have to adopt is that the ignorant mind has the capacity to display all possibilities of suffering. They do not have to adopt a cosmology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Here I'm writing there is no any lineage outside Buddhism and Bon now. Someones believe otherwise here...

Malcolm wrote:

It is really amazing how persistant and wrongheaded your mischaracterizations are.

I never stated anywhere that there was at present a lineage of Dzogchen that existed outside the container of the religions known as Buddhism and Bon.

What I said was that in order to practice Dzogchen one does not have to sign up and become a Buddhist or a Bonpo. Two entirely different statements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Lets say we decide to take ChNN's theory of the origin of ZZNG as being the correct theory. There is no evidence in what scholars consider to be "early Bon" that the Bonpos had a theory of rebirth that corresponds to the Pan-Indian cultural idea of the six lokas.

Adamantine said:

There is not much known about "early Bon" at all so there is hardly room for much beyond speculation. . .Not much to go on as a basis for your arguments.

Malcolm wrote:

One thing for sure, Bonpos did not have a Buddhist cosmology.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

...experiences of realms are just as real as our experience of our human realm.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is to say they are not real at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In reality there are no six lokas anyway.

M

Adamantine said:

In "reality" there is no reality. But relative to our shared experience of the human realm, the 6 lokas exist: according to Buddhism and Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not true. For human beings, there is no hell realm, not deva realm, no ghost realm: when is the last time you saw any types of sentient being that was not a human or an animal?

When you have the experience of a hell being, you will not have any awareness of human beings, devas, etc.

The six lokas are merely potentialities in our bodyminds. Right now that potentiality is expressing itself as the human realm. The six lokas are not external realities that exist side by side like six bookshelves which have books on devas, asuras, humans, animals, pretas and hell beings.

To put it another way -- ignorance can experience itself as any of the six lokas. This does not say anything about some "objective" or "relative" existence of the six lokas.

It may be convenient for someone to believe in the relative existence of the six lokas, but it is pretty hard to defend the existence of the six lokas as anything more than the expression of traces. And when we are not expressing those traces those realms do not "externally" exist for us in any way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

The point is, how do Dzogchen teachings function without any belief, in the sense of Batchelor's "Buddhism Without Beliefs"? I don't think based on what and how ChNN teaches, that this is his intent.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen practice does not depend on a literal belief in the six lokas. It depends on the understanding that the ignorant mind can generate all false appearances because of not perceiving our true condition. Six lokas practice merely eliminates the traces for those false appearances. For example, for us, there is no hell. We do not perceive hell, hell is outside our experiential range. For us hell is completely false. For a hell being, the human realm is completely false. The root of both is an ignorant mind that has traces to produce those experiences. We do not need to imagine the six lokas exist anywhere other than in our own bodyminds.

But I did not advance Dzogchen as radical empiricism. The Dzogchen proposition that our experience of sentient beings and the world is a misperception of radiant wisdom light is sufficient to put an end to the idea that it is.

However, the essential point in Dzogchen teachings is direct introduction and an experience of instant presence. That does not depend on any belief at all other than desire to come to recognize one's real state.

Considering that the body of light is a commonly advanced desiderata of Dzogchen practice, it is difficult to be a radical empiricist ala Batchelor, Dawkins and Harris and practice Dzogchen.

Lets say we decide to take ChNN's theory of the origin of ZZNG as being the correct theory. There is no evidence in what scholars consider to be "early Bon" that the Bonpos had a theory of rebirth that corresponds to the Pan-Indian cultural idea of the six lokas. But they had Dzogchen. Later, when the Dzogchen lineage of Garab Dorje entered Tibet, the Bonpos adopted a number of ideas from the adoption of Buddhism including the bardo, six lokas, and so on.

So, there are number of angles we can approach this from without having necessarily adopt scientific atheism as our view.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

BTW, I don't have a horse in this race: however, there are simple points that don't hold up to scrutiny. Perhaps that is why you are not responding to them in any adequate way. For instance, purification of the six lokas: standard Dzogchen preliminary-- how do you relate to this if you simply do not believe in karma, bardo, or rebirth in the six realms?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, anyone can see they have five afflictions. So if they understand the six lokas as being metaphors for the six afflictive states, then they can do the practice without beleiving in rebirth.

In reality there are no six lokas anyway.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Yes great idea, so he can become pissed again.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes I can see it now:

Dear ChNN:

Your student Malcolm says anyone can practice Dzogchen, they do not have to become a Buddhist. He even says Dzogchen is not Buddhist, it goes beyond Buddhism. Is this really true? I really think Malcolm is harming Buddhism and ruining people's paths. I am sure he is going to go to hell for eons, but I just want to make sure that I am right, so I am writing to you to confirm my opinion. He is a really bad person, and is confusing everyone with all this talk of Dzogchen being an independent vehicle, and the fact that you do not have to get a Buddhist name to practice Dzogchen. He even says that Dzogchen is a separate lineage in Bon! But we all know that our compassionate Padmasambhava took pity on the poor ignorant Bonpos and manifested as a teacher to till the soil a bit to make them ready to receive the seed of our wonderful true Buddhist Dzogchen(tm). Please write back soon so that I can tell him and everyone else how wrong he is.

Thanks,

Faithful Buddhist Snitch

PS It does not matter that he has introduced scores of people to your teachings via webcast via private emails for the past 10 years, he still is a very bad man.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Btw, insofar as I understand Malcolm doesn't disagree with the notion that Dzogchen is 'the essence of Buddhist teachings'. On the contrary, he's been arguing that Dzogchen is very much the essence of Buddhist teachings - as well as of any other 'spiritual' teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, my point is that Dzogchen, our true state, is the essence of all Dharmas and that it just not come from the store bearing a tag that says "Made in Buddhism".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Buddhadharma, even if it recognizes a greater value in human life, still sees significant value in the lives of all other beings, including animals. Part of this is recognizing that our own mindstreams can incarnate in such forms, and that any animals or other beings may have been a close relation to us in prior lives. This is a practical way to see an equalizing factor that instills a naturally arising empathy: Kantian theory doesn't even have a trace of this. I don't find any solace in his ethical theory regarding animals.

Malcolm wrote:

The point of this exercise was not to say that Kant's teaching was better than the Buddha's. The point was to remove the objection that a theory of rebirth was necessary to behave as a moral agent, which is essentially what DKR was saying. I did not agree with it when he said it in Walden, I do not agree with it now. And I never would be so foolish as to use it as an example.

However, there is a level of sophistication of discourse in western moral philosophy which is absent in Buddhist philosophy. As you know, moral philosophy did not end with Kant, nor begin with him.

It is a good thing we have such as a Journal of Buddhist Ethics, because slowly Buddhist philosophers will gain sophistication when discussing these issues among themselves and with others.

On the other hand, Buddhists also use animals as things all the time.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

If you follow Dzogchen as a system of assertions...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't. Others may.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Christians, and everyone will experience sound, lights and rays in the bardo.

M

Adamantine said:

So says your religion. (Buddhism). A Christian will not agree that this is what everyone will experience.

Personal experience trumps belief, even Buddhist beliefs.

You are claiming personal experience of the bardo after death?

Malcolm wrote:

No, of course not. I would have to die in order in order to have that experience and I don't remember the last round.

But, even if you don't accept rebirth, practicing Dzogchen will help you relax in this life, and if you have experience in this life, then when you find yourself in the bardo, you will know what do to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Origins of Anuyoga in Kyrgyzstan

Content:

Sherlock said:

ChNN has said a few times that anuyoga was mainly transmitted to Tibet from what is currently Kyrgyzstan. Does anyone have more information about this? There does not seem to be an archaeological record of a literate, Buddhist culture there. Could it be instead a reference to the Tocharians?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on whether you identify 'Dru sha as a corruptions of "Turkish" as ChNN seems to, or whether you think 'bru sha is Gilgit, which is the modern academic consensus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Other students of Changchub Dorje?

Content:

Sherlock said:

Are there any other known students of Changchub Dorje besides ChNN? If so, are they teaching? IF not then I suppose most of them are still in Tibet and quite old now; does anyone know where Changchub Dorje's gar was?

Malcolm wrote:

Lama Wangdor is one, and there may be some others in Tibet near Khamdo gar. Changchub Dorje's grandson is alive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All deity practices represent a method of trying to discover your primordial state. Also that is the purpose of Dzogchen. If you are doing the latter you don't need to do the former.

M

LunaRoja said:

I don't understand how Dzogchen practice can erase your previous commitments and maybe this commitment is to another Dzogchen master.

Malcolm wrote:

Who said anything about erase? One's commitment is to discover one's primordial state. As long as that remains your focus, there is no problem at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Let's examine: ChNN and other teacher of Dzogchen point out that for most of us, we will not reach liberation in this life, but in the bardo. Like the Garuda, born fully grown once the egg hatches. How are we to interpret this outside of the teachings on the bardo? As a Christian, or Muslim, or Amazonian Shaman, (or existentialist) you will have your own structured belief about what happens immediately at the time of death, which may contradict bardo teachings. How does this fit with the argument that any denomination of any tradition can also be a full-fledged Dzogchen practitioner? At a certain point, they will have to choose to discard one version, or the other, ---or both will lose all sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Christians, and everyone will experience sound, lights and rays in the bardo. If they practice Dzogchen, they will learn how to recognize this experience.

Personal experience trumps belief, even Buddhist beliefs.

Adamantine said:

It seems all or most of the people arguing for an autonomous Dzogchen are part of the Dzogchen Community, --as Malcolm points out, a very human institution. Are we arguing for a Dzogchen without the Dzogchen Community? Why would we? That's where the teachings are held, cared for, and transmitted. Same with Buddhism. And they are not different. In DC, Rinpoche has us do Tuns and Ganapujas which have very Buddhist, tantric, practices..

Deity Yoga, mantra recitation, seven line prayer, protectors, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Institutions are impermanent. They develop, flourish and then die out. Buddhism developed, flourished, and is now dying.

Dharma, on the other hand, is eternal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I am aware, and I am aware of how completely amoral Kant was in regards to animals. As he determined animals to be not rational, and without wills, he saw them as mechanical and in no need of any ethical treatment. It is traces of Kantian theory which I believe lie at the root for the scientific atrocities that are perpetrated on animals every day in modern society, not to mention industrial animal farming. I find Kant completely ethically bankrupt on this count. I couldn't think of a worse example.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing Kant with Descartes:

Any action whereby we may torment animals, or let them suffer distress, or otherwise treat them without love, is demeaning to ourselves

-- Immanuel Kant.

Adamantine said:

Maybe Kant developed a little more subtlety around his approach to animals than Descartes, but he still retained the view that animals were without will, and basically mechanical. I don't see how you can have it both ways, I don't think he did much to further any ethical approach to animals, when he continued to further Cartesian paradigms. Anyhow, even in the above quote, the act of killing is not included as being problematic.

Malcolm wrote:

,

If a man shoots his dog because the animal is no longer capable of service, he does not fail in his duty to the dog, for the dog cannot judge, but his act is inhuman and damages in himself that humanity which it is his duty to show towards mankind. If he is not to stifle his human feelings, he must practice kindness towards animals, for he who is cruel to animals becomes hard also in his dealings with men.

-- Kant

That the Buddha did not accord animals the same status as humans can be understood from the mere fact that killing animals is an act which requires mere confession with no punishment at all, like drinking alcohol, digging in the earth or plucking the leaves off of trees. For a Buddhist monk, masturbation is considered a more serious offense than killing an animal, requiring not only confession but a form of stringent probation in isolation. Needless to say, killing a human or even a human fetus is a parajika offense which causes one to lose one's vows completely.

In general, the prohibition against killing for lay people primarily means killing humans, but has been extended to all sentient beings though long and ancient custom as an extension of Ahimsa, formally included in Tibetan Buddhism as a commitment of refuge in the Dharma. But the discussions of killing in Abhidharma, etc., never involve discussions of killing animals, only the murder of human beings.

The practice of ahimsa is actually separate from the vow of not taking life, since ahimsa extends not only to animals but plants and other features of what we considered the natural environment. Ahimsa is not a vow. Ahimsa is an ethic, a way of life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

cloudburst said:

Sorry if I upset anyone!

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, no one is upset here.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Back then, when you made those statements, you were (obviously) sure of their validity, as you are sure of the validity of your current statements.

Malcolm wrote:

Hopefully we all are capable of being self-reflexive and seeing where we have erred.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

I am aware, and I am aware of how completely amoral Kant was in regards to animals. As he determined animals to be not rational, and without wills, he saw them as mechanical and in no need of any ethical treatment. It is traces of Kantian theory which I believe lie at the root for the scientific atrocities that are perpetrated on animals every day in modern society, not to mention industrial animal farming. I find Kant completely ethically bankrupt on this count. I couldn't think of a worse example.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing Kant with Descartes:

Any action whereby we may torment animals, or let them suffer distress, or otherwise treat them without love, is demeaning to ourselves
-- Immanuel Kant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

Horses are slaughtered everyday in USA and used for petfood. I can't speak to how things may have been done in old Tibet, but clearly the meat-for-food industry was questionable using muslims as butchers, etc. as a way to distance themselves from the killing, even as they were placing the orders. However, I don't think it would have been too unusual to find dead animals in old Tibet either.. harsh climate. . especially at a time when weather-control would have been deemed necessary. I assume Malcolm can clear all this up, having been close with Ngakpa Yeshe Dorje.

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly this phenomena of using muslim butchers is a Lhasa custom. In other regions, where Muslims were not to be found, Tibetans had to kill their own food animals. It is a pratical necessity.

Actually, it is just a fact of samsara -- animal husbandry and salughter provides the raw resources for virtually all organic farming. This is one reason why I think the vegans are nuts. They are not living in the real world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

However Malcolm told us that his ngakpa teacher did indeed perform a blood sacrifice of real animals as part of a weather controlling ritual of some sort.

Adamantine said:

I think you are mistaken here Kirt. Malcolm can clarify, but I recall that NYD may have used some horse heads or something as an offering to placate certain entities with control over the weather, -- but he did not kill these animals or order them to be killed. In this sense, it does not seem much different than ganapuja or protector offerings that include meat.

kirtu said:

I hope that I am mistaken but horse heads can't be that easy to come by. Cow heads unfortunately are another matter. But look, in old Tibet how would this ritual have been performed? Would they have waited around for some animals to die naturally and then to encase the head or other animal part in some kind of resin for reuse, etc.? Probably not.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans, especially nomads and farmers, slaughter animals quite regularly (by suffocation usually, basically waterboarding them), feel bad about it, and try to purify the effect of that karma yearly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

kirtu said:

However Malcolm told us that his ngakpa teacher did indeed perform a blood sacrifice

of real animals as part of a weather controlling ritual of some sort.

Malcolm wrote:
I never said that.

They went to an abbatoir and procured the head of a bull that had been slaughtered.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:42 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:
In regards to the philosophical approaches to ethics within an existential or scientific-materialist framework, perhaps there can be found an infinite number of reasons to act ethically. But ethics are completely subjective in many ways, as is the idea of non-harm. For many, capital punishment, or abortion as a means of family-planning, or even torture are considered ethical for many. And even if some nominal sense of ethics can be found in materialistic traditions or those of other religions, your above quotations included, I think the six paramitas would be way outside of their comfort-zones, and would appear completely nonsensical.

Malcolm wrote:
It is quite clear from your statement you have not delved into the Western tradition of moral philosophy very deep.

The impact of Kant's metaphysic of morals is very simple, and can be stated as follows:
"A rational being has the obligation to protect other rational beings, even and especially at their own expense because rational beings must never be used as a means for our own end as we would never wish to be used as means."

The entire human rights movement grew out of Kant's moral metaphysics. In terms of moral philosophy, Buddhism is far behind the curve in terms of sophistication, for the most part still in the 14th century somewhere.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:34 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

gregkavarnos said:
I imagine many here will find themselves with egg on their faces and their feet lodged firmly in their mouths.

Malcolm wrote:
What the hell does that mean Greg?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:30 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Adamantine said:

Malcolm, with all due respect you were at the same teaching and brought up this same quote, with a similar point in a thread about Reggie Ray on Esangha a few years ago. He wasn't in your list of things you felt sorry for, should he have been? If you've completely gone 360 on this issue, that is fine, it is sad to see you join the ranks of Stephen Batchelor though.

Malcolm wrote:

With all due respect, I never said that ethical action without believing in karma was impossible. I think it is a foolish thing to say.

As far as Ray goes, I criticized him for saying that rebirth was not a necessary part of the Dharma taught by the Buddha. He was wrong to say that. So, not I am not sorry for making that observation. If someone claims that we can eject rebirth as so much Asian baggage, that person is not teaching the Dharma of the Buddha correctly.

Just because I feel a little sad for some things I have said does not mean that I have necessarily changed my opinions about these issues. It just means that I recognized the folly of creating enemies when it is not necessary.

Adamantine said:

I also strongly disagree that Dzongsar Khyentse's statement is intellectually impoverished. .

Malcolm wrote:

I find the suggestion that moral action only to be possible in the context of rebirth a repugnant claim.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:24 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
mindyourmind said:
Hi Malcolm

I understood all of that the first time you explained it. I just cannot agree with you that

somehow Buddhism is a human construct, a human institution (and it shows), but Dzogchen is not.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhism is not Dharma.

mindyourmind said:
Another big disagreement there.

Your cynicism is really not good to see, Malcolm. I know there is this wordplay going on about the meaning of "Buddhism" and "Dharma", but I just look at that in plain language, and this trip of yours not something I want to be a part of.

Malcolm wrote:
As I said, Buddhism is just a container. Bon is another. Dharma is beyond these things. We categorize these things into convenient categories put them on shelves, and then we begin to think the label is the food.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 25th, 2012 at 12:02 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
mindyourmind said:
Hi Malcolm

I understood all of that the first time you explained it. I just cannot agree with you that somehow Buddhism is a human construct, a human institution (and it shows), but Dzogchen is not.

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhism is not Dharma. Just a container.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:54 PM
Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona
Content:
conebeckham said:
The "touched my genitals" thing vis a vis a Yamantaka empowerment? WTF?

Malcolm wrote:
Come on, admit it -- you're just jealous!!!

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

What many are saying is that they can conceive a Dzogchen that can be practiced by people who don't identify themselves as Buddhists and that there's the possibility of Dzogchen standing outside the limitations of any denomination, Buddhist or otherwise. I keep failing to understand why this is polemic. Do you think Dzogchen must be considered Buddhist to work?

heart said:

Not at all, for me you are free to experiment. Anyway, who could stop you, the pope of Buddhism? The whole way through this long thread my only point is that Dzogchen is, and have been since Garab Dorje, a part of Buddhism. As I said many times, for me Dzogchen is the heart of Buddhism.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and no one told you that you could not or should not feel that way.

I don't agree with your historical read, however.

For me, Dzogchen is the essence of Dharma, be it samsaric or nirvanic, but not all Buddhists accept all Dharma as valid, as we see in this thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Whatever the fancy images, it is still a samsaric institution, with flawed beings creating all kinds of political and financial tensions. I don't see how it is superior to what you are critiquing in so-called Buddhist institutions. There are the same tensions about fundraising, supporting centers, paying rent, and not allowing people who are too broke to pay into the teachings. (Yeah, I know there are free webcasts but that is not unique to the DC).

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, the flaws in the DC comes from people. Good thing no one thinks the DC is Dzogchen, not even in the DC.

As far as the webcast go, no one is teaching profound Dzogchen the way CHNN is via webcast. They just aren't. I don't know why. There are perhaps many reasons, distrust of

technology, concerns about samayas, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

If we don't believe in samsara, and rebirth, as Dzongsar Khyentse pointed out in his teachings on Abandoning the Four Attachments: it would be a lot easier and more fun to just rob a bank and retire to some exotic island, enjoying sensory pleasures indefinitely.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh this is total nonsense. There are many reasons to behave ethically, and most people behave ethically merely because it is in their best interest to do so, no medieval threats of hell realms needed.

You know, when ever Buddhists bring this example up, normal people look at them like they are completely full of shite and just consider them fundamentalist weirdos.

These kinds of statements by eminent Buddhists teachers are intellectually impoverished. They make these statements largely out of cultural ignorance of the centuries of upon centuries of very pointed western philosophical inquiry into the nature of morals and ethics.

My father is a former philosophy professor and he would consider such as proposition above childish and simplistic, which indeed it is.

Apparently Dzogsar as never read Kant's Groundwork For a Metaphysics of Morals nor does he know anything about the categorical imperative. Indeed, the human rights movement grew out of Kantian moral metaphysics.

1) Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law without contradiction.

2) Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end.

3) Therefore, every rational being must so act as if he were through his maxim always a legislating member in the universal kingdom of ends.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Adamantine said:

Right. And anything else, organized around "Dzogchen", is just theoretical.

Malcolm wrote:

Well Dzogchen Community is not very organized. It has no sangha of monks, no hierarchy of practitioners, no unified corporate structure, etc. This, in a real sense, is Dzogchen community:

In the center there are the Dzogchen Teachings. Surrounding that are the gars, then the gakyils, the groups of practitioners, then individuals, all interconnected. The Gars, Gakyils, and groups have three colors, symbolizing how we collaborate. The individuals in the periphery have the same color as the teachings in the middle symbolizing that we all have the same state. Everyone is the same, no one is higher, no one is lower.

Adamantine said:

I think the point is that there is nothing wrong with the essence of Buddhism...

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with Buddhadharma, there are many things wrong with Buddhism.

Adamantine said:

The point is maturing in one's own practice to be able to discover the essence, and not holding on to the labels, whatever they may be.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but to discover that essence you do not first have to put on the label "Buddhist".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

According to your new Dzogchen without Buddhism or what?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is a human institution developed by ordinary human beings, and it shows.

mindyourmind said:

Right there is an example of a statement that is quite acceptable, here on the Dzogchen

sub-forum, but to comment on it may be again construed as policing, living in a cage, living with limitations etc.

Are there any institutions not made by humans? If so, what are they? Is Dzogchen a human institution, and does it show?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a "human" institution. There are human institutions that have been built up around Dzogchen teachings, and like all such things, they are subject to the flaws of the humans that participate in them. The purpose of Dzogchen Community, for example, is to assist people's development of the knowledge of Dzogchen in themselves, first and foremost through following a qualified master who has that knowledge. This is the purpose of any group of people assembled to develop the knowledge of any teaching. But whenever you have people gather, also there is always a very real probability that some people will not have a perfect understanding. Thus, Dzogchen Community is also not a perfect institution. People in the Community, as in any community, make many mistakes. However, they are gathered to develop Dzogchen teachings among human beings. Dzogchen Community is not a very traditional organization in the Tibetan Buddhist sense of the term. There is no emphasis on reproducing the forms and culture of Tibetan Buddhism in the DC, unlike other organizations. This is because ChNN found there was no point in doing this, because while human culture is wonderful and rich, Dzogchen is beyond cultural limitations. Of course he loves his own culture, but he has no interest in converting people to the culture of Tibetan Buddhism because we are not Tibetans.

When human institutions become old and entrenched, very often the institution becomes more important than the people it was originally designed to serve. This point is very much lost in this discussion. People always say "We should serve the Dharma" but what happens in reality is that we wind up serving "Dharma" institutions, and naively, merely perpetuate the eight worldly dharmas. The same is true of the Catholics, Anglicans, Governments, etc.

A great deal of this thread has been devoted to the question of whether it is important to consider Dzogchen a part of Buddhism. Well, one of the reasons this question has not been answered is because it is obvious Dzogchen exists within Buddhist institutions. Some people think that because it exists in Buddhist institutions, this makes Dzogchen "Buddhist" and that this limits Dzogchen to Buddhism.

I sure don't share that view. Dharma in general does not belong to institutions. The Buddha himself never created a single Buddhist institution. Garab Dorje never created a Dzogchen "Institution" -- he never built a temple, or a shrine, etc. Also Chogyal Namkhai Norbu did not create Dzogchen Community. He merely gave this name to the group of students that spontaneously gathered around him in the mid '70's when he decided there was sufficient interest in Dzogchen. Why did he give a name? Because they were following Dzogchen teachings. They were not following "Buddhism". They were not Buddhists, the vast majority of them. They did not become "Buddhists" just because they became students of Dzogchen teachings. Most of the early students from that

period of time still do not consider themselves "Buddhists". They were never told by their teacher they must consider themselves "Buddhists". The only thing they were told is that they were learning a teaching called Dzogchen. Buddhists who came to receive teachings were never told they must not call themselves Buddhists. The only thing they were told is that they were learning a teaching called Dzogchen.

As I said, I came to Dzogchen through Tibetan Buddhism. I am nominally a Buddhist. But I don't feel particularly Buddhist any more in so far as I feel a strong cultural allegiance to any Buddhist institutions be they Hinayana, Mahayana, or Vajrayana. I feel like a Doctor of Tibetan Medicine, and a Dzogchen practitioner.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Does it not show once more Dzogchen is not without Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

It shows a characteristically Buddhist approach to Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

According to your new Dzogchen without Buddhism or what?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is a human institution developed by ordinary human beings, and it shows.

Adamantine said:

So is Dzogchen Community, isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community is not Dzogchen. It too is a human institution, and it shows.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

According to your new Dzogchen without Buddhism or what?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism is a human institution developed by ordinary human beings, and it shows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thank you, the old well-know Namdrol, I'm glad you again are here Please read our archives.

Malcolm wrote:

I am happy that you feel you have successfully tilted a windmill.

Mariusz said:

According to your new Dzogchen without Buddhism or what?

Malcolm wrote:

I was referring to your quixotic effort to prove that relative truth was not entirely false. Now lets please return to the topic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Ouch, sound problems

Conceptual said:

Try opening the webcast in two tabs — audio webcast & video webcast. Mute the audio in the video tab. I find that alleviates any issues.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a good idea -- it puts extra strain on server.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

I have already debated successfully it with Namdrol in many forum threads in Dharmawheel, as for example "the seeming is not totally faulty".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you feel you have. Others have a different perception of your "success".

Mariusz said:

Thank you, the old well-know Namdrol, I'm glad you again are here Please read our archives.

Malcolm wrote:

I am happy that you feel you have successfully tilted a windmill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

I have already debated successfully it with Namdrol in many forum threads in Dharmawheel, as for example "the seeming is not totally faulty".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you feel you have. Others have a different perception of your "success".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

To complain about being misunderstood, more than once, could also simply mean that a message was conveyed poorly...

Malcolm wrote:

In my case, no.

mindyourmind said:

...as opposed to the recipients twisting the message.

Malcolm wrote:

In their case, yes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The president of Golden Dawn and current member of national parliament, Mihaloliakos, taking his dogs out for their afternoon walk. images.jpg

kirtu said:

This is truly frightening stuff. Why is radical nationalism making a come back in Russia, the Balkans and Greece?

Kirt

treehuggingoctopus said:

Don't forget about France (Marine le Pen), Finland's True Finns (ponder the name!) and the Netherlands (Wilders). Those guys are fascists as well - suit-wearing types, sure enough, not boneheads - but fascists nonetheless. The whole Third Position talk is ridiculously easy to see through.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is Nationalist Socialism. But the causes of it are neo-liberalism at the core, the gutting of national economies and infrastructure in the interest of so called "free trade".

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I have signed up but not received any notification about membership. How long does this process take? Who is the best person to call to attempt to expedite in time for the start of the retreat tomorrow?

Thanks to all for your help!

Malcolm wrote:

Call Harold at tsegyalgar

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Democracy in the country that gave birth to democracy

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The president of Golden Dawn and current member of national parliament, Mihaloliakos, taking his dogs out for their afternoon walk. images.jpg

kirtu said:

This is truly frightening stuff. Why is radical nationalism making a come back in Russia, the Balkans and Greece?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

It is a symptom of the weakening of local economies under the forces of international globalization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Abandoning past practice commitments

Content:

Inge said:

Hi!

A few years ago I prematurely attended some teachings and empowerments that were given with lifetime daily practice commitments. Afterwards I struggled immensely with these practices for maybe a half year or so, but they made no sense to me, and I ended up doing them out of guilt, and fear of vajra hell. Then I gave them up altogether. Now I only try to follow the teachings of ChNN, do Guru Yoga when I remember, and other DC practices when I have time and energy, but I still fear negative consequences for abandoning past practice commitments. This is due to the snake in the bamboo image. I find it unreasonable to go to Vajra hell just for attending some teachings. I might understand if it was due to some kind of practices that manipulated the pranas, etc., that if done wrongly might lead to madness, etc., but just for attending empowerments and teachings? It does not make sense. I was thinking at the time that going could only be a good thing, that nothing bad could come from attending. So this was my motivation. I did not know anything about the teacher, lineage, teachings, practices, etc. So in this case, what am I to do?

Malcolm wrote:

Don't worry about it at all. With Ati Guru Yoga you are going into the essence of all teachings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Alternatives for the Dzogchenpa

Content:

Sherlock said:

Malcolm once said that if you received the teachings from ChNN and did the practice daily (I assume guru yoga?) he guarantees that you will face no difficulties upon death. I'd also be curious to know his answer.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Inge said:

Is this also the case for non-recognizers like me?

Malcolm wrote:

If you apply Ati Guru Yoga with diligence, then you will face no difficulties at death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 24th, 2012 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

As for advanced results such as obtaining the rainbow body or four visions while for example dismissing emptiness in favor of worshipping Jesus or Jehovah then Malcolm is undecided.

Malcolm wrote:

I really wish you would stop having my opinions for me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Curious Treasury ...

Content:

Sönam said:

It is certainly very much 9 yanas approach ... for a treasure

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Man ngag mdzod is not about Dzogchen specifically niether is the grub tha' mdzod or

the yid bzhin mdzod. Only the other four.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I'm wondering how someone from another 'faith' background can work within the Dzogchen tradition if they frame their experience and practice in terms of prayer. Is it that prayer is a secondary practice if you are a Christian Dzogchenpa? Or is it that by becoming a dzogchen practitioner you will no longer have need for a belief in Christianity or in the need for prayer?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner who is a Christian, presumably it means you still participate in your denomination, sing hymns, etc., because these things for you are meaningful. Perhaps your family is Christian and it is important for them that you continue to participate in the Church. I honestly do not know how it works for these people. But since ChNN has any number of sincere students who are followers of his who nevertheless continue to participate in other faiths besides Buddhism, all I know is that it must be possible to integrate this with Dzogchen teachings since people seem to manage to do it.

I am not in a position to judge them -- merely note that they do not see a conflict. Perhaps they see God, as ChNN suggested, as meaning their primordial potentiality -- I have no idea.

So I prefer to remain open.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Many of us have been saying you can enter the Dzogchen or other dharma vehicles' paths being of other beliefs but in advanced stages of Dzogchen for example the person can not hold contradictory beliefs and expect results.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not need beleifs for Dzogchen. Just personal experience.

username said:

For example denying emptiness or grasping to a solid god. Or for example can not support the violent behavior of people like Muhammad and take refuge in him while expecting thogal advanced results or rainbow body.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't support Mohammed's violent behavior. Never said that I did. However, no one takes refuge in Mohammed, not even Muslims. They go for refuge to Allah.

username said:

I just mentioned an exception of someone, who can enter the path but not expect advanced results holding on to such old beliefs, which disproves your global rule and shows your misrepresentation of what Rinpoche says as invalid.

Malcolm wrote:

What global rule?

username said:

Thirdly with regards to such messages from you and others proclaiming peace and claiming to be right on yet constantly attacking squares like me, who had been against your extreme ultra orthodox views on the other extreme end till recently, with personal attacks:

Malcolm wrote:

No extreme ultra orthodox views here. But I do know how to play the scales of tenet systems as well as anyone, and when someone in the past said something that was out of line with tenet systems as I understand them, I corrected them. But as anyone who has followed my career online, I have wavered between orthodoxy and liberalism as much as anyone. When I was participating in the administration of E-Sangha, I felt we had to maintain a certain orthodox position viz Buddhism. I recognize now that was an error. Not because it is wrong to be na orthodox Buddhist, but all Buddhists have a very different idea of what that means and we were more or less enforcing an Indo-Tibetan idea of orthodoxy. So yes, I have varied between very liberal expressions and very orthodox ones. Sorry for being so human.

More recently, you decided of your own volition to get into with me because I felt you were mispresenting Gaudapada, etc., and I told you so. In response you went ballistic.

You have completely ignored my basic statement: "I am not saying that every path leads to the same liberation, but where we can all agree is that everyone is seeking the peace and happiness that comes from freedom, and if we maintain presence and awareness of this fact, we can go beyond limitations regarding religion".

Then of couse, some people decided to have a metadiscussion about whether there is indeed liberation in other schools (something I never claimed. I hope so, but I don't follow those schools so I don't know). People trotted out various criteria for what differentiates Buddhist from non-Buddhist, for example, the idea of being an insider as

someone who is concerned with their mind -- and I showed this definition equally applied to the Yoga system and others. Someone else advanced the idea that it was the four seals -- but I showed that this can be found in Advaita as well. Other people asserted that as far as Bon goes, they only achieve liberation because they adopted Buddhism -- that is quite kind in its spirit, but interestingly, you did not critique Bonpos for plagiarism, only poor Guadapada. I merely pointed out that dogmatic assertions that liberation only occurs in Buddhism are just that -- dogmatic assertions with no substance. I have in the past said the criteria for what constitutes liberation in this school or that school differs so dramatically that it is impossible to judge. All one can say is that in many cases, it does not resemble what Buddhists imagine liberation to be. And when it comes to Dzogchen, a lot of Buddhists cannot fathom what liberation is Dzogchen is. So there you go.

I also pointed out that the most trechant and sustained criticism of Dzogchen has come from within Buddhism and that it continues to this day. And I do feel a lot of Nyingmapas mispresent Dzogchen completely, perhaps they mean well, but a lot of Nyingmapas just don't get it because they are so conditioned by the Kadamapa outlook.

I have also said that Dzogchen is a personal experience, as you well know. If someone comes to Dzogchen who is a rabbi, for example, they do not need to shed their rabbi skin just because they are a Dzogchen practitioner. They can continue just as they are. Dzogchen is not a matter of belief. Having a Madhyamaka view makes you no nearer to Dzogchen than having a Christian view. That is my present understanding. If one does not have that unique personal experience called "Dzogchen" than one is very far away from Dzogchen. If one is trying very hard to discover that experience than one can be called a Dzogchen practitioner. If one has that experience and the attendant confidence in that experience, then one has no need of any beliefs at all -- which I also said.

Frankly, this thread has come to the point where I am responding to things I never said merely because someone claimed that I said them. That is a pity since it is waste of time for people to make such remarks and it is a waste of time to respond to them. So I am putting everyone on notice. If you make a claim about something I have said which in fact is not what I said -- I am not going to respond at all. I will not longer respond to distortions and misrepresentations. If you want to quote something I said and give an opinion of it -- fine. For other posts, in order to garner a response from me, that post must contain a direct citation. Otherwise, I will ignore as I choose.

Thanks,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Isn't it amazing how people that are not bound by golden cages, who aspire to be free of most normal constraints and who practice non-duality daily end up, in the Dzogchen forum, with a thread 60 pages and counting.

It's hilarious.

Malcolm wrote:

One, you cannot "practice" non-duality; two, no one said anything about being free from normal constraints. Another misrepresentation.

The level of misrepresentation in this thread of what I have said is most astonishing.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

... dismissing the Victor Shakyamuni's Buddhadharma as unnecessary for Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

Actually my point was quite different. But whatever, misrepresentation of what I have been saying has abounded in this thread, so I shan't expect it to cease now.

username said:

So you are still saying that someone taking refuge and prostrating 5 times a day to the God of Muhammad knowing full well he beheaded hundreds of a certain innocent Jewish tribe guilty of only giving water and food to another Jewish tribe who were being starved to death women and babies included and those hundreds beheaded one by one included young teenage boys which they do not deny and sharing in that collective karma by intention, can go through the four visions and necessary thogal practices onto rainbow body? And that is what Rinpoche says?

Malcolm wrote:

Username, when is the last time you beat your wife?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

... dismissing the Victor Shakyamuni's Buddhadharma as unnecessary for Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

Actually my point was quite different. Just to remind you:

This is a very good question. I have been moving slowly toward the pov of view that for most people studying these lower yānas is a complete waste of time. Oh, it can be useful to study a bit of Abhidharma because it helps contextualize mandala practice, and Madhyamaka does help cut through intellectual proliferation, properly studied and absorbed. Studying a bit of Madhyamaka helps one avoid the pitfall of crypto-advaita. ...etc.

The one absolutely indispensable thing is direct introduction. There is no path of Dzogchen without that at its head. If people are unwilling to put into practice the methods of Dzogchen following receiving that, this is their limitation and there can be no help for it.

Dzogchen includes the meaning of all Buddhadharma, so one cannot say that by practicing Dzogchen as an independent path, one is dismissing Buddhadharma as unnecessary. One can dismiss the organized religion that has accreted around Buddhadharma i.e. "Buddhism", the corresponding socio/political/economic institutions, as unnecessary for Dzogchen practitioners.

For example, most of the primordial teachers of Dzogchen did not have a monastic Sangha -- only Ser'wöd Dampa and Shakyamuni did. But Garab Dorje did not. The rest of these teachers had various kinds of retinues, some had retinues of buddhas, others of bodhisattvas, some of daknis, others of yakshas and rakshasas. For example the retinue of Nangwa Dampa was 1002 Buddhas, as well as devas. We have no insight into the social organization and hierarchies of buddhas, bodhisattvas, devas, dakinis, yakshas and rakshasas. We only have insight into the social organization of human beings.

"Unnecessary" does not mean "should never participate". I have made it clear that if someone, a Dzogchen practitioner, likes to participate in shrines and temples constructed by Buddhists than they should. I like shrines. They can be beautiful. The most moving place for me so far in my life was seeing the Jowo in Lhasa, and being in Samye -- and being in the Yarlung Valley. Shrines can also be gaudy and unnecessary.

If someone likes to think of themselves as Nyingmapas, or Kagyus, or Sakyas, or Gelugs, its ok with me. I am not saying to anyone they need to feel the way I do.

While other people consider Shakyamuni the most important teacher of all, I consider Garab Dorje more important. Garab Dorje is the most important teacher for Dzogchen, even more important than Padmasambhava (for Nyingmapas, perhaps Padmasambhava is more important). Why? Because Garab Dorje, not Padmasambhava, not Shakyamuni, taught the six million four hundred thousands lines of Dzogchen tantras, all the Dzogchen tantras that had been taught by all the previous Teachers of Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

... dismissing the Victor Shakyamuni's Buddhadharma as unnecessary for Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

Actually my point was quite different. But whatever, misrepresentation of what I have been saying has abounded in this thread, so I shan't expect it to cease now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=77770#p77770> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, I did not call CTR a jerk. I said, "Frankly, in this story, Trungpa just comes across as a clueless jerk."

Pretty different statement. I am quite certain the waitress though he was a total jerk.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All I said about Trungpa that he seemed to me like an ordinary person based on the related episode. I guess calling someone an ordinary person is a bad thing. I honestly do not know whether Trungpa was realized or not. And I don't care much. He has been dead for more than twenty years. Perhaps he was completely naive about guns. Really. I reacted when I said that. I am sorry it offended you.

username said:

No recently you said you doubted his realizations and said he was a jerk. Also your attacks on him goes back years. Again dishonest.

Karma Dorje said:

Saying Trungpa was a jerk is a simple statement of fact. He slept with his student's regardless of whether they were in a relationship or not. He promoted a preening and predatory student as his successor that ended up killing those he should be protecting. Was he a siddha? Perhaps, but irrespective of his realization, he was a jerk.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think I said he was a jerk. Someone recounted an episode where he apparently was trying to shoot a gun at a bird. The owner of the gun took it away from him and shot the bird in front of Trungpa. I think what I said was "for me, Trungpa is an ordinary person".

I said it on a thread on Chris Battis's facebook page. Should still be there.

As far having said other negative things about CTR -- I never said a peep about him ever.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

[But you are facing some obstacles in this aspect. .

Malcolm wrote:

Hi username:

No obstacles, quite the opposite. But like any good vintage of wine, you have to let things sit in the bottle for some years.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

conebeckham said:

So much energy and emotion invested in proving points, dicing up the vegetables.....and so many assumptions being made about other people's statements....it's quite exhausting. To coin an essential Dzogchen instruction...."Relax."

IMO, Namdrol's not making stew. Nor is he devaluing any path, unless that path takes an exclusivist stance. He was quite clear about where he felt certain paths "go wrong." Now, Dzogchen can be accused of taking that same stance...but if you really

understand what he's saying, I think all these conceptions and assertions can be sidestepped if one understands that, in Dzokchen, all that is just so much wind. Personal experience, one's own personal experience, is so removed from that stuff.

He's not "endorsing" Hinduism, or "demeaning" Buddhism. He's also not validating any path but the one he practices. He's saying, simply, he can't "know" those paths he doesn't practice, personally, and therefore can't condemn them or call them invalid-- how could he? And how can we? Yes, we can point out logical and conceptual inconsistencies, but when we do so we are so in danger of missing the forest for the tress, you know? Don't forget the forest, even when you're lopping branches off trees, and be careful lopping of branches.....they may, or may not, block the view. I'm happy he's happy, and I am grateful for his words.

Malcolm wrote:
Thanks Cone.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:54 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Mariusz said:
I'm not naive. Limitations/calculations are necessary to survive in this world.

Nangwa said:
This samsaric world that is.
Get rid of those limitations and we just might get rid of samsara.

Mariusz said:
It was about genuine lineages of dzogchen also. You want to get rid them also.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, that is what I want, I want to get rid of the genuine transmission of Dzogchen (not)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:49 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

I have critiqued the Buddhist reception of Dzogchen in ...India...

M

Matylda said:

Dear Malcolm, maybe I missed it somewhere in this long discussion, but it I am curious about India and dzgochen reception there... could you elaborate a little bit or give some source. I am interested in it.

Malcolm wrote:

The basic gist of it is that standard Vajrayāna received institutional support from the beginning primarily because it was heavily grounded in Yogatantra. For example, the Guhyasamāja is also listed among the 18 tantras Amoghavajra brought to China in the early 8th century, if I recall correctly. And the mother tantras such as Cakrasamvara, Hevajra, also received approval as well. The reason for this, as far as I can tell, is that they never sought to supercede the path structure, the abhisamaya process, as described in sutra. They were tantras that utilized Abidharma, as it were, differently. So for example, the 37 dākinīs in the Cakrasamvara mandala are described as being representative of the 37 bodhipakṣa dharmas, etc.

But Dzogchen tantras makes little or no use of these schemes at all. While they indeed make reference to the peaceful and wrathful mandalas mentioned also in the Guhyagarbha, they treat these quite differently than the Guhyagarbha treats them. However, since these mandalas are mentioned in the Dzogchen tantras, especially the Rigpa Rangshar, and since the Guhyagarbha mentions Dzogchen explicitly in the body of the text, exegesis of the Guhyagarbha became a mandatory study since the Guhyagarbha has Indian commentaries and is based on verifiable Sanskrit text. Though Indian originals of the 17 tantras, the 18 sems de lungs and five tantras, and the klong sde tantras and so on either never existed or were lost, The Guhyagarbha as well as the Vajrakīlaya fragment tantra, among others, provided a key link through which the adherents of the old translation school could proclaim that contrary to the accusations leveled by Go and others could claim that Dzogchen had an authentic ground on Indian soil. Because the monastery of Samyas burnt down several times, many precious Indian manuscripts were lost. Also the manuscripts of Samyas were written in I beleive Gupta script, which was not readable by most Indian panditas by the time fo Atisha, since the script in question used at that time was Pala, I think.

Anyway, according to the annals of the lineage of Dzogchen, Dzogchen received an incredibly hostile reception from Buddhists both in India and Tibet, confined to a very small group of practitioners and never grew in prominence in India as part of the siddha movement, in the same way as the more normative "Buddhist" tantras in which Mahāmudrā is grounded. Thus, by the eleventh century, and certainly much earlier, all trace of Dzogchen and even the Guhyagarbha tantra was erased from Indian history as if it had never existed.

One possibility is that since the Bonpos had a teaching of Dzogchen already, when the Garab Dorje lineage of Dzogchen was introduced to Tibet they took it up immediately and with enthusiasm. They never produced any polemical literature against Dzogchen,

instead they incorporated the Garab Dorje lineage of teachings, and even Garab Dorje himself, into ZZNG. But because they preserved Dzogchen clearly, also Dzogchen was framed as Bon teaching. Certainly I have read polemics to this effect. Then there is the Nyingma crib that Tapihritsa, one of the most important masters of ZZNG was really an emanation of Guru Rinpoche, which actually is proof that the Nyingmapas recognize that ZZNG preceded the advent of Buddhism in Tibet.

The Buddhist history of Dzogchen is very much bound up with the fact that Indian Buddhists rejected Dzogchen overwhelmingly -- according to the annals of Dzogchen, the 17 tantras, for example were concealed in Nalanda. When Vimalamitra went to Tibet, Nalanda handed the only copy of the extant Dzogchen tantras surviving and thus Dzogchen disappeared from the subcontinent, or so the story runs. The difficulties facing Vairocana and Vimalamitra in Tibet are well known.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 8:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Your work here is benefiting many and I hope it continues in force as well as looking forward to your translations as I think you might be the best living English translator but can not fathom why you procrastinate so much.

Best of Luck to you.

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks, that's a nice compliment.

As to the other thing, I am not procrastinating, but the process of bringing out a proper translation is pains-taking, and since I am very productive, the sheer amount of raw translations I need to edit is rather staggering. And it is not in my nature to allow editors to edit my work without my approval and discussion of every change. I need to live another 50 years.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Finally I would like to point out that I am typing these responses with a smile and consider you overall a good Vajra brother.

Wishing you all the best as ever.

Malcolm wrote:

I consider your objections to be largely incoherent in many respects, others sort of along the lines of "When is the last time you beat your wife", and a large number of obvious distortions as anyone can plainly see.

Be well,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Malcolm. Why are you not just waiting if the hypothetical experiments with non-buddhist or non-bon people will succeed in their fully realization of 4 visions of dzogchen thogal according to instructions of Namkhai Norbu or any other buddhist/Bon master, and further if their future non-buddhist/non-bon lineages will survive outside Buddhism or Bon? I agree with username. You are still fighting although only on speculations. Earlier you were fighting sakyapa with protectors based on some facts. So it even got worse. Buddhism was the institution where Dzogchen fully survived! Not Hinduism or other.

Malcolm wrote:

You just keep right on dividing up the world into limitations. But at the end of the day, the only one you are limiting is yourself.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Hi Malcolm,

I hope you are well. I merely said first in this thread that he got a lot of his ideas from buddhist yogachara schools and rebranded them which he did as Hindu. Even back then which was not so long ago when you founded a new school you were supposed to come clean if a lot of your tenets were based on someone else's completely different religion. Today they claim they had it all along.

Malcolm wrote:

Gaudapāda acknowledged the Buddha as the source of his ajativādin arguments. Shankaracarya sought to cover this up in his commentary on the Agamasastra. But we were not talking about the latter. We were talking about the former, and you were the one that used the term "plagiarism" to describe his literary activity. I have studied that Agamasastra in detail.

username said:

Malcolm I don't think you can accuse me of narrowmindedness after I praised nisargadata and even said he was probably a Tulku.

Malcolm wrote:

Proclaiming that Nisgardatta must have been a Buddhist Tulku can be seen as a kind of narrowness. This is a kind of narrowmindedness we see all the time among Buddhists -- everything good and interesting that we like in other religious schools must somehow be the activity of Buddhist tulkus, as if nothing good can come about in the world if it is not tied to some explicitly Buddhist institution or belief.

username said:

Yet you never mentioned Trungpa, a major terton, who you called something bad recently as well as saying you doubted his realization. Or others.

Malcolm wrote:

I made a blanket apology since I have said so many things and offended so many people, it is all I can do. I am sure people are still offended. But after a certain point it becomes their problem and not mine.

All I said about Trungpa that he seemed to me like an ordinary person based on the related episode. I guess calling someone an ordinary person is a bad thing. I honestly do not know whether Trungpa was realized or not. And I don't care much. He has been dead for more than twenty years. Perhaps he was completely naive about guns. Really. I reacted when I said that. I am sorry it offended you.

username said:

You say you're heart is now filled with love but you don't stop someone here attacking anyone against your views with personal attacks in your defense.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not defended anything, not have I attacked anyone. I have not attacked you either. I said you displayed narrowness in your post.

username said:

You praise all schools and religions and yet attack and have no understanding for buddhist institutions ' mistakes which is still less than the other religions outside Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

My point about this was when we examine who really persecuted Dzogchen teachings,

it was not Non-Buddhists, all the Non-Buddhists I have ever talked with about Dzogchen think it is cool. The Bonpos were totally into Dzogchen. They took to it like ducks to water. There is no history of Bonpos attacking Dzogchen, none at all.

I have found it is Buddhists who raise the largest and most sustained arguments against Dzogchen. And so I recounted that history. These things are merely facts -- facts are not attacks. I can understand however that many people's hackles are raised because I am presenting these things in the open. I understand the polemics against Dzogchen quite well.

username said:

If you said other religions fleece their students and screw their flock then it would have been fair but you just attack buddhist ones. And many have written here they perceive you attack Buddhism too.

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite sure there are false teachers in every religion, just as there are sincere ones. But since I am not privy to the sordid details of the false guides in other schools, I don't really have much to say about them. What I am familiar with is the situation of Tibetan Buddhism and the presence of a great deal of corruption and malfeasance in its institutions.

username said:

I am sorry Malcolm but you just changed one group of people you attacked with another, not your basic attitude.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I have not attacked anyone. I have critiqued the Buddhist reception of Dzogchen in both India and Tibet and traced a little bit of the history of how it became normalized within the institutions of Tibetan Buddhism.

Now, I am sorry that you feel attacked, but I am equally certain that I am not attacking you or anyone else.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

Buddhist's point was that Gaudapada copied it, rebranded it and presented as something new of his own. Plus he came much much later than centuries of Buddhist philosophical debates he "ripped off" without quoting the sources. Sort of intellectual theft and plagiarism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is completely unfair. In his Agamasastra, he prostrates to the Buddha openly. He was beyond limits of Hindu and Buddhist sectarian divisions. He used arguments of derived from Mahāyāna to tease a middle way between Samkhya (satkaryavādins) and Vaisheika (asatkarvādins) perspectives and establishes ajativāda, the position of non-origination.

I am sorry to say, username, this is exactly the type narrowness that is a problem. Why is it a problem for some intelligent brahmin to make use of Buddhist arguments when he sees that they point out a deficiency in some other tenet systems perspective? Are you implying that to make use of a logical formula derived from Madhyamaka, you must declare yourself a Buddhist? This is like insisting that in order to practice Dzogchen, you must declare allegiance to Buddhism.

Also Karma Vajra has a point, the ethos of ancient scholarship did not include the idea of plagiarism. This is a modern idea based on capitalism.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The nirvana of the early Buddhists is an attributeless unconditioned consciousness as Peter Harvey very eloquently shows in his *The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism*.

xabir said:

The point is not pure consciousness. There is nothing wrong with pure consciousness. It is making it into an ultimate reality, ultimate ground, a transcendental essence that is despite being said to be beyond conceptual notions yet clung to as truly existent (despite how they want to phrase it being beyond notions of existence etc which is simply trying to express the non-conceptuality of that reality, it will always be treated as an ontological essence which therefore leads to clinging to the ultimate ground).

I do not believe Theravada talks about consciousness as an ultimate ground, and the Buddha actually rejected the view of making nirvana into a source right in MN 1 and Thanissaro Bhikkhu made a good commentary on it.

Malcolm wrote:

Unconditioned means ultimate, generally speaking.

Brahmin is not a ground in the sense of prakriti. It is a ground only in the sense that since it is not recognized, māya emerges, etc.

My point all along being is that also Advaita, like Dzogchen and other forms of Dharma recognize that ignorance of our true nature is the real problem, and the solution is to discover that real state.

The rest is semantics after a certain point. Nevertheless, I am not committed to a position that is stating absolutely Advaita realization and Buddhist realization are the same. My only point is bringing this up is shake up the tree of dogmatic clinging to views.

As I said, all human beings are searching for the peace and happiness that comes from freedom. We can go beyond sectarian limitations by keeping this point in our minds.

As for myself, I am a Dzogchen practitioner. My religious background, obviously is Buddhist. I am not a Bonpo. But first and foremost I am a practitioner of the path of Dzogchen. Buddhist teachings and practices which assist that practice can be useful. Those that are not, I don't use and leave them aside for others to use as they wish.

But Dzogchen in the end cannot be reduced to "Buddhism" -- Dzogchen goes beyond these sectarian, ideological and culture limitations. Of course these days there are many teachers who teach a system called "dzogchen", an elaborate textual system culled from many texts. But this is not real Dzogchen, this is an intellectual system. This kind of teaching is very far away from the real meaning of Dzogchen. Like anything with an extensive literature it is possible to turn "dzogchen" into a mere intellectual trip. We must keep this in mind.

This is not the Dzogchen I have learned from my principle gurus. The Dzogchen that I have learned from my teachers is based on personal experience. Frankly, talking about Dzogchen in absence of that personal experience is a bit like talking about sweet to a man who cannot taste anything. Nevertheless, in order to encourage people to pursue these teachings who express interest I talk about the teachings.

The point of this is not to engage in intellectual discussions about whether Dzogchen is Buddhist or non-Buddhist. Honestly, I don't care anymore. I don't care whether people think I am a Buddhist or non-Buddhist. I have no interest in defending Dzogchen as a part of Buddhism. If people want to think it is not part of Buddhism, that is ok with me. If people want to think it is part of Buddhism, that is ok with me too. If some people decide they do are not interested in Dzogchen because it is "not buddhist" -- this is your loss. If someone people think they should only study Dzogchen because it is part of Buddhism -- this is your limitation.

Dzogchen is path of personal recognition of one's primordial potentiality, the basis, one's true nature, dharmatā, and integration into that, and that is all — it is not a school, a religion or a philosophy. You can be a Buddhist, Bonpo, or not, and practice Dzogchen. In the end Dzogchen is about the our state of innate freedom and learning to be in that state.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you understand atman to mean your primordial potentiality, for example the way the word bdag nyid chen po (mahātman) is used in Sems sde and so on, then there is no real difference. Just as if one understands "God" in these terms, then there is no problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

xabir said:

Brahman is an ultimate reality that is beyond notions of existence and non-existence, because Brahman is deemed as a transcendental, unchanging and independent ultimate reality that cannot be accessed with concepts. It is attributeless pure consciousness.

[/i]

Malcolm wrote:

The nirvana of the early Buddhists is an attributeless unconditioned consciousness as Peter Harvey very eloquently shows in his *The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Sherlock said:

From an old thread

The basis in Dzogchen is completely free of affliction, it therefore is not something which ever participates in afflicted dependent origination. Unafflicted causality in Dzogchen is described as lhun grub, natural formation. However, since there is causality in the basis, it also must be empty since the manner in which the basis arises from the basis is described as "when this occurs, this arises" and so on. The only reasons why this can happen is because the basis is also completely empty and illusory. It is not something real or ultimate, or truly existent in a definitive sense. If it were, Dzogchen would be no different than Advaita, etc. If the basis were truly real, ultimate or existent, there could be no processess in the basis, Samantabhadra would have no opportunity to recognize his own state and wake up and we sentient beings would have

never become deluded. So, even though we do not refer to the basis as dependently originated, natural formation can be understood to underlie dependent origination; in other words, whatever is dependently originated forms naturally. Lhun grub after all simply and only means "sus ma byas", not made by anyone.
Sorry, I'm a bit confused now. So based on your current readings Malcolm, does Advaita actually say that brahman is real/ultimate/truly existent?

Malcolm wrote:

Some would hold the basis as lhun grub, and lhun grub as a self. This is one of the six perspectives about the basis which the Dzogchen tantras reject,

You can find statements by Advaita authors that define brahmin as real, you can also find statements by advaita authors which deny this kind of real existence to brahman in their effort to show that brahmin goes beyond all limitations. Advaita, like everything, is not monolithic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

I don't see how emptiness negates lhun-drub at all, unless you view emptiness as Brahman instead of as freedom from extremes. Emptiness is the condition of all phenomena. I don't understand why you keep talking about it as something other than the nature of phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

lhun grub is not a phenomena, and has nothing to do with phenomena. Phenomena are a result of ignorance that does not recognize the basis. Lhun grub is one of the three wisdoms inherent to the basis, the visible side. Ka dag is the emptiness aspect of the basis, the non-visible side. Energy/compassion is the inseparability of those two.

Now pay careful attention: I never equated Dzogchen with Advaita, nor did I venture an opinion on the nature of realization in Advaita. I said I don't know what Advaitans and other Hindus realize. I never denied that Dzogchen was a Buddhadharma.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2012 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

I am talking about Ācārya Dharma Vajra in that article. He is talking about Madyamaka not Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

He mentions both.

mzaur said:

Define empty. Is Atman free from extremes or not?

Malcolm wrote:

Empty = lacking inherent existence. Atman is not free from extremes. Atman is Brahman, and Brahman is inherently existing. When I talk about Brahman, I refer to Nirguna Brahman (undifferentiated sat chit ananda)

Inherent existence is an extreme, no?[/quote]

First of all, that definition of emptiness is incomplete unless you are a Gelugpa.

If you investigate carefully, you will discover that Brahmin is considered to go beyond this notion of inherent existence [svabhāva] since it is considered to be beyond predicates and extremes and thus is inexpressible.

Now, I am not saying that Advaita and Madhyamaka are precisely the same -- but in terms of linguistic formulation, it is very difficult to distinguish them.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

It's actually very easy to differentiate the two.

<https://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.com/2009/02/madhyamika-buddhism-vis-vis-hindu.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Sridhar SJB Rana's response first of all is just crypto-realism:

"First of all, to the Buddha and Nagarjuna, Samsara is not an illusion but like an illusion."

And he is wrong -- I have addressed this issue at length elsewhere on this forum. Rongzom clearly states that in Dzogchen at any rate, all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions:

mzaur said:

He isn't talking about Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, he is.

mzaur said:

Second, Bhavaviveka admits that the distinction between the Vedantic Atman and the Buddhist Anatman is extremely difficult to parse.

It's not difficult at all. Atman is not empty.

Malcolm wrote:

Define empty. Is Atman free from extremes or not?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

Yes, Advaita does teach that there is an ultimate space which is the source of all reality, all phenomena. But this is wrong view according to Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chos dbyings mdzod states "Everything arises from the dharmadhātu, everything subsides into the dharmadhātu..."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mzaur said:

I would agree with Namdrol that Dzogchen is not Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Namdrol never said this, nor does Malcolm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

But I am saying that when you study these things, philosophically, at any rate, it is very hard to show the difference between Advaita and Madhyamaka.

mzaur said:

It's actually very easy to differentiate the two.

<https://awakeningtoreality.blogspot.com/2009/02/madhyamika-buddhism-vis-vis-hindu.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Sridhar SJB Rana's reponse first of all is just crypto-realism:

"First of all, to the Buddha and Nagarjuna, Samsara is not an illusion but like an illusion."

And he is wrong -- I have addressed this issue at length elsewhere on this forum.

Rongzom clearly states that in Dzogchen at any rate, all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions:

"Likewise, the system of dzogchen realizes and is the culmination of the comprehension of all phenomena as totally equivalent with illusions. That being the case, the mind is not confused by the power of appearances and there is no ability to develop formations; nothing is adopted, nothing rejected, nothings moves, nothing is sought. As such, this culmination of the comprehension of being like an illusion is also proven to the culmination of comprehending the two truths as inseparable."

And:

"Because the system of dzogchen understands four things for all phenomena— understanding what is to be abandoned; understanding what is to be taken up; understanding what can be left in equanimity; and what understanding what can never be actualized, it establishes all phenomena as non-dual. At that time there is no difference between non-duality, homogeneity, [68/a] non-arising, naturelessness, emptiness and selflessness. Since that is so, because this proof of all phenomena as non-dual is the heart of all intimate instructions, therefore, [dzogchen] is “the heart of

all intimate instructions”

Second, Bhavaviveka admits that the distinction between the Vedantic Atman and the Buddhist Anatman is extremely difficult to parse.

Third, as I already pointed out, Santaraksita complains of the Advaitan, since they accept the non-arising nature of phenomena, which is the Tathāgatas position, for what reason then do they not simply join the Buddhist fold.

Fourth, the similarities between Advaita and Mahāyāna did not go unnoticed by Hindu scholars, with the Dvaita Vedantins and others going so far as to accuse Shankaracarya of being a crypto-buddhist.

So, while I am not claiming that Advaita and Madhyamala are making the same point, I am pointing out that it is much more difficult to differentiate them mere sectarian declarations like Shridhar Rana makes in his article.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Eckhart Tolle says experiential wise Dzogchen is identical with Advaita and Zen.

Malcolm seems to be echoing the same words now.

Not saying that's a bad thing. It's probably true.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not saying that. I don't know what Advaitans experience. I was simply making the observation that if we reduce Buddhism to the three or four seals, well Advaita can fit that description too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Bon

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to understand the situation of pre-Buddhist bon than read Drung Deu and Bon by ChNN.

Lhug-Pa said:

Not if many Böns had become corrupt back then.

From what I've learned there are basically three types of Bön:

"Black" Bön

"White" Bön

Yungdrung Bön

"Black" Bön is apparently Shamanism more or less devoid of the Dzogchen of Yungdrung Bön.

"White" Bön is apparently Bön mixed with Buddhism mainly for the purpose of avoiding persecution.

Yungdrung Bön is Eternal Bön which has the pure Dzogchen Transmission, such as the Zhang Zhung Nyengyud.

It would have been "Black Bön" that would have fallen into some nasty sorts of practices, corruption, etc.

But I believe that all three forms of Bön have Shamanistic practices.

It seems that these days most Bönpo's teachings are a mixture of White Bön and Yungdrung Bön.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

username said:

What we often forget is that many of our previous lives was as different lifeforms in other worlds. Apart from the thousand Buddhas there are infinite types of manifestations of nirmanakayas in the universe and each Buddha emphasizes different aspects to suit the time and location. Dzogchen is also having separate histories in the thirteen lucky worlds that receive it in a large sector. The final fruit of the fourth vision is an actual dissolution of all phenomena back into the basic pure aspect of ultimate space. This includes the path and deities which should not be solidified by vajrayana practitioners either out of habit. Even if not dismissed in the higher Anuyoga yana the deity is nevertheless an empty clear manifestation that arises and dissolves from and back into that space. Thinking otherwise out of habitual needs is a great fault even in vajrayana.

mzaur said:

Sounds like Brahman. You sure that's Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It's static in the sense of been seen as a 'oneness'. Now I understand the necessity of the Uttarat Tantra Shastra. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

You could draw the same complaint against Dzogchen.

For example: Shankaracarya writes:

In its identification with the five-sheaths the Immaculate Atman appears to have borrowed their qualities upon itself; as in the case of a crystal which appears to gather unto itself colour of its vicinity (blue cloth, etc.,).

This is exactly how the gdangs of original purity is described when discussing essence.

Again, I am not saying Advaita realization and buddhahood are the same. But I think that in general Tibetan Lamas are terribly ignorant of the subtleties and profundity of non-Buddhist systems such as Advaita, Trika, Samkhya and so on. They generally only read about them to refute them, and badly at that.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Could you explain the root of the Shugden controversy? I have never understood it.

Malcolm wrote:

It's complicated, but it ultimately emerged out of Mongolian Gelug anxiety about the growth of Nyingma practitioners in that region. Shugden is very strong in Mongolia. It is stronger there than in any other country.

M

dakini_boi said:

So Shugden's main original function was to stop the spread of Dzogchen? And that is one of the reasons he is considered by HHDL to be a harmful worldly force?

Malcolm wrote:

Not Dzogchen, Nyingmapas. Of course Pabhongkha accepted the sectarian polemics against Dzogchen and the terma tradition but this is way off the point. We should stop here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I once forced Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso to admit (I have a witness, incidentally) that there was no substantial difference between Advaita Vedanta and Gzhan stong in terms of how they presented their view. His only response was a sectarian polemic "But there is no buddhahood in Vedanta!" Now, mind you, I am not saying that there is such a thing. But when you study these texts, you come to realize, even as Bhavaviveka and Shantaraksita both observed, that language of Advaita and the language of Madhyamaka are more or less identical. Shantaraksita complains in his Tattvasiddhi to the effect "If you accept the nature of things is non-arising, why do you not become Buddhist!?"

M

Andrew108 said:

Hi Malcolm. Lovely post again. Great to read this. One thing though. The assertion of buddhahood in Shentong and it's absence in Vedanta is not merely being sectarian. It's of vital importance. The reason is that buddhahood / buddhanature is dynamic and responsive and is an active non-duality rather than the Advaita assertion of unchanging passive non-duality.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a misreading of Advaita. Advaita is a great deal more subtle than your summary here. Maya is the sport (lila) of Brahman, so it is not static at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Could you explain the root of the Shugden controversy? I have never understood it.

Malcolm wrote:

It's complicated, but it ultimately emerged out of Mongolian Gelug anxiety about the

growth of Nyingma practitioners in that region. Shugden is very strong in Mongolia. It is stronger there than in any other country.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Well he does say things like "unify all teachers of all traditions" but I have found it always in context with Buddhism and Dzogchen. Nowhere (that I know of) does he directly say things like "unify with your Catholic priest", but he did say things like you don't have to (I think it wasn't that you can't, just that it doesn't make much sense) unify with your teacher of carpenting or Jesus etc.

Malcolm wrote:

When I first heard ChNN explain Ati Guru Yoga he said unify all teachers of all knowledge you have received from a positive source, no matter what it is. I beleive at the time he included school teachers as an example.

Since the vehicle of gods and men is included in the nine yānas, then this also includes all teachers one may have had or will have who are not necessarily Buddhists. This does not mean you are mixing traditions. It means that all knowledge you have learned contributes to your integration and practice of your main path, in this instance, Dzogchen.

BY the way, just to be clear, I am not for one second advocating combining this or that random thing with Dzogchen. Absolutely not. We have to respect other traditions, and we have respect Dzogchen. "Combining" is not respecting. That is why I rejected Jikan's propostition about "Hindu Dzogchen, Catholic Dzogchen, etc. There is only one Dzogchen. But it can be practiced by anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 22nd, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State

Content:

Will said:

One of these days I will have to finish Crystal.

Since Dzogchen has been around for a very long time and been part of many Asian cultures, what other names might it be known under besides Ati Yoga? Also, in ancient Dzogchen were ashrams or monasteries or some sort of groupings standard or was it wandering yogis and scattered lay disciples or both or neither?

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has asserted that it may have influenced Chan. I am sure there is a little influence of Taoism. Taoism and ancient Bon have a lot of similarities, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Now (and here I refer back to the original post) it seems that to experience the state of Great Perfection one does not need the theoretical framework (method) of Buddhism (or Bon, or even Dzogchenism), the only thing that is needed is know the state (have it pointed out to you). I believe though that without Buddhadharma (and by this I mean a system of practice that is based on the Four Dharma Seals, something that Dzogchenism is also) one would have no opportunity to abide in the true nature of their mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

What are the four seals?

All conditioned phenomena are impermanent.

All afflicted phenomena are suffering

All phenomena lack identity

Nirvana is bliss.

You can find these four seals in Advaita Vedanta as well. Just substitute brahman for nirvana and you have a perfect match. It is very hard to differentiate brahman from nirvana. Really, go ahead and try.

I once forced Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso to admit (I have a witness, incidentally) that there was no substantial difference between Advaita Vedanta and Gzhansong in terms of how they presented their view. His only response was a sectarian polemic "But there is no buddhahood in Vedanta!" Now, mind you, I am not saying that there is such a thing. But when you study these texts, you come to realize, even as Bhavaviveka and Shantaraksita both observed, that language of Advaita and the language of Madhyamaka are more or less identical. Shantaraksita complains in his Tattvasiddhi to the effect "If you accept the nature of things is non-arising, why do you not become Buddhist!?"

Now, again, I am not saying that if you practice Advaita you will become a buddha -- I honestly do not know. But I am saying that when you study these things, philosophically, at any rate, it is very hard to show the difference between Advaita and Madhyamaka. The main difference between them is that Hindus accept the Vedas as self-originated and

Buddhists do not.

But in Dzogchen we accept that Dzogchen tantras are self-originated, that they arise directly out of the sound of dharmatā. So, this is not really very different than what the Vedic scholars believe. For example, the Song of the Vajra is just the intrinsic sound of dharmatā, the state of realization of Samantabhadra and Samantabhadri in union.

Though Dzogchen tantras do take pains to differentiate themselves from Upanishadic doctrines of the atman, these very same ideas get used in Dzogchen in a very similar way -- which is why there is a rebuttal in Dzogchen tantras of certain ideas we find in the Upanishads so we don't run out and say "The Upanishads teach the same thing as Dzogchen".

So we can find a lot of parallels in Dzogchen and non-Buddhist teachings. The one main difference between Dzogchen and most non-Buddhist traditions is that in Dzogchen there is a definite rejection of creation by a creator. Even in Advaita, on a relative level, they accept Ishvara as a creator. So this is an important difference.

Don't believe it when people say that Kun byed rgyal po is a Buddhist creator myth. It is not true. Kun byed rgyal po refers to the mind. It does not mean Samantabhadra is a primordial creator deity or a kind of Buddhism theism. People who claim this like Alan Wallace and Eva Dargay-Neumier are mistaken.

But as Chogyal Namkhai Norbu says, "God" can be understood as a symbol of one's primordial state. So we do not necessarily have to reject "God" if we are Dzogchen practitioners, if by "God" we mean our own primordial potentiality and the primordial potentiality of everything. This is why we have that famous passage the text on Rigpa from the Tibetan Book of the Dead, cribbed by Shabkar in this way:

Now then, fortunate beloved children, listen!
Concerning this important term widely known as "mind",
in terms of existence, the mind does not exist as a single entity.
In terms of sources, the mind is the source of the diverse happiness and suffering of
samsara and nirvana.

Assertions about the mind exist in many categories of the vehicles.

The mind is designated by inconceivable different names:

ordinary people call the mind "I";
some non-Buddhists give it the name "atman";
the shravakas call it the "selfless person";
the mind-only school gives it the name "mind";
some call it "the perfection of wisdom";
some give it the name "sugatagarbha";
some give it the name "mahāmudra";
some give it the name "madhyamaka";
some give it the name "the single unique sphere";
some give it the name "dharmadhātu";

some give it the name “all-basis”;
some give it the name “ordinary mind”.
Although it is given inconceivable names,
since it is just this mind in reality, one must recognize it.

You must let the mind itself go free just where it is.
Having been let go, naked ordinary awareness,
a clarity that cannot be seen by looking for it,
the clear and vivid personal experience of vidyā,
is not established in any way at all, empty and pellucid.
Brilliant non-dual clarity and emptiness
is not permanent— not established at all;
is not annihilated— clear and vivid;
is not single— manifold, knowing and clear;
is not manifold— indivisible, one taste.
Not existing elsewhere, this is one’s own vidyā,
the true face of the original guide dwelling within one’s heart,
seen here right now in one’s personal experience.
Never be separate from this beloved children!

We could add a passage:

"other non-Buddhists give it the name “god”..."

This passage illustrates the point I have made all along. We do not need to imagine that all faiths lead to the same point, we merely have to accept that all humans beings are trying to find the same thing: the peace and happiness that comes from freedom.

I feel that Dzogchen is one path which can lead all of us beyond all schools so we can all find that peace and happiness that comes from freedom. Why? Because whatever measure of freedom, and the ensuing peace and happiness, I have found comes from practicing Dzogchen teachings.

Someone might object, and say but what about your Sakya practice, etc. Of course all of these things have helped. But I was a very sectarian Sakyapa, even while receiving teachings about Dzogchen, I was very conditioned by Sakya Pandita, and so on. For me, Dzogchen was just another completion stage system. I found it very hard to understand Dzogchen as a separate independent path because I was so conditioned by the Sakya school's point of view, conditioned by Madhyamaka before that, and so on. I can't really say when my present understanding arose. I think it has been some time. To a large extent, in the past few years, I have been slowly shedding my fabricated identity as a "buddhist". If it is important for others such as Buddhist to regard me as a buddhist, that's ok, but that is more about them than it is about me. For me "Dzogchen practitioner" is enough.

I have been thinking about my comments about Dzogchen and how they related to Mahāmudra. I think one can say the same thing about Mahāmudra. I also think that

Mahāmudra in a real sense transcends the boundaries of sect and culture. Why? Because it too is based on direct introduction.

I think it is possible to teach Mahāmudra and Dzogchen without insisting on the label "Buddhist". In India, the siddhas taught Mahāmudra to Buddhists and non-Buddhists alike. Naropa had many non-Buddhist students, actually, just as one example. Gorkshanatha is a mahasiddha who practiced both Vajrayāna Buddhism and Shaivism side by side. If you read his texts he moves from Shunyatā to Shiva in one breath.

Some people think that what I am saying amounts to pissing on Buddhism, but that would be a wrong perception. What I am saying is that there is no happiness in these labels "Buddhist", "Christian", "Muslim", "Hindu", "Jew" and so on-- none at all. We all have the same nature, the same primordial state. It is time we recognised that in each other and put an end to the pretense of otherness. According Dzogchen doctrine, all sentient beings will realize their primordial state. I can't say if this is really true, but I hope it is. A Christian might say "We and everything else were all created for His (i.e. God's) enjoyment." This is very similar to the Shaivaite idea of all phenomena being the lila of Shiva. This is very similar to the idea of all phenomena being the rol pa, display of bodhicitta, in Dzogchen and Virupa's statement in his Doha:

All sentient beings are emanations of mahāmudrā,
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.

We should be circumspect about criticizing others since that creates enemies in a concrete sense. I guess a large part of my present point of view has a lot to do with the sectarian arguments I have taken part in here on this board and E-sangha. Really, I feel very sad about that. We were all trying to do our best on E-Sangha -- but I myself, and we together, admins and mods, made many mistakes.

I feel a little sad about what happened with Jax. Oh, I don't agree with his approach or much of what he says, and I find it sad that he has positioned himself as a master when there are more qualified masters one can follow; but I feel a little sad that I was so harsh with him. It was unnecessary and disrespectful -- so since you are reading this, "Sorry Jax, my bad". That action of mine turned a person into an enemy. This is my fault. The same is true of the rest of what I have to say.

I also feel sad about my strong criticism of the Aro folks and Kirkpatrick. Of course that came about because I am a student of Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje (whose memory is dear to me-- I was with him at the very end of his life -- he showed me personally how a real yogi faces death). But in the end, given all the evil that is in the world today, what they are doing is not really harmful at all on any level. Actually, Kirkpatrick has a beautiful farm and tries to help people in Pemakod, etc. So this is a good thing. Chogyam has a ranch near Kalispell Montana and likes to dress up like a 1880's cowboy. I am sure they have a lot of fun. To be honest, while we were all groaning, pissing and moaning about the Aro thing, they were largely ignoring us and having a blast, so who really lost in that

exchange?

I am not really sorry for criticizing the NKT. I think the practice of Shugden is a harmful erroneous practice and should be ended. But on the other hand, they are never going to listen to what we say, so what is the point of saying anything at all? They are very successful, people like their scene. We should leave them alone.

We also leave alone animists in Africa, and they make blood sacrifices to some very heavy worldly deities every day, deities that are much worse than Shugden. Millions of chickens, goats, and cows are sacrificed to them every year in Africa. But at least they eat the animals afterwards, and in many instances their motivations are perfectly altruistic (which is not to say they won't turn to black magic in a second if they feel threatened by an enemy) because they are making offerings to benefit the whole world -- this is what they believe. Also the NKT strongly believe that what they are doing is positive. In other words, if someone is practicing something we think is based on an error, we just avoid that practice ourselves. Still of course, if someone asks me about them, I am going to be honest and say "Better you look elsewhere." But if someone is happy in NKT, it is not our job to condition that person. We also need to respect that person, even when they make what we might consider poor choices.

I am also not sorry for [lightly] criticizing the Diamond Mountain scene. I think that there are many things going on in that scene that are pretty unhealthy. But again, apart from observing that it is not for me, what else is there to do? And I feel sad that Christy Macnally's second husband died such an awful death and that she is in pain (Michael Roach was husband number 1).

I do feel sad for having criticized Lama Tsongkhapa's point of view. This is the sectarian side of the Sakya school that I find distasteful. I also find it distasteful that we in the West just pick up and carry Tibetan polemics as if they are our own. This is a mistake.

I feel sad for having allowed Theravada people think that I feel their practice is inferior.

I am sorry about the whole Zen thing, the Jundo Cohen episode. I tried to handle that skillfully, but it was Indo-Tibetan sectarian bullshit on my part, even though my motive was to try and bring clarity about who was a monk and who was not.

I also feel sad about having indulged in Sakya polemics about Kagyu Mahāmudra.

There are probably many other things I should feel sad about in my online relations with others. But I can't remember everything I said. So, my blanket apology is-- If I said something upsetting to you that came from narrow-mindedness on my part, I am sorry". So I have made a lot of mistakes. I am sorry that I hurt anyone.

I do not believe that anyone who is attached to a sectarian outlook, whether towards Buddhists or towards non-Buddhists can really be a fully integrated person. I do not believe that such a person, be they a student of Dzogchen or "master", has integrated the meaning of their primordial state completely.

All the conflicts in the world come about because of religion and ideology, whether political or economic. But Dzogchen is not based on ideology or belief, it is based on personal experience that is introduced by a master, someone who has integrated that knowledge into their life completely.

My personal goal in this life is to be as integrated as I can be. I have still have a lot of work to do on that score, but I am trying. That for me is the main point, in case anyone cares.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Now (and here I refer back to the original post) it seems that to experience the state of Great Perfection one does not need the theoretical framework (method) of Buddhism (or Bon, or even Dzogchenism), the only thing that is needed is know the state (have it pointed out to you). I believe though that without Buddhadharma (and by this I mean a system of practice that is based on the Four Dharma Seals, something that Dzogchenism is also) one would have no opportunity to abide in the true nature of their mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

What are the four seals?

All conditioned phenomena are impermanent.

All afflicted phenomena are suffering

All phenomena lack identity

Nirvana is bliss.

You can find these four seals in Advaita Vedanta as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

No, because both all Buddhist vehicles--Sutra, Tantra, and Dzogchen(as a path)--sprouted from Shakyamuni's ultimate realization, and that ultimate realization is what is the real Dzogchen. So again, all enlightening paths--whether provisional or direct--

come from realization, not religions and their adherents.

gregkavarnos said:

So in effect the title of this thread: "Dzogchen and Buddhism" is actually invalid. Why? Because the discussion in this thread revolves around Dzogchenism and Buddhism, NOT ultimate realisation/true nature/ultimate nature... and Buddhism. Unless, of course, one wishes to make the preposterous claim that realisation of ones true nature only comes through Dzogchenism OR that Buddhism is not a valid path to "uncover" ones ultimate nature.

Malcolm wrote:

I titled the thread Dzogchen and Buddhism principally because many people think, as I once did, that you need to have a lot of instruction in other Buddhist topics before approaching Dzogchen teachings. This is the standard, post-Kadampa approach.

Understanding of other foundational Buddhist topics is necessary for people who are going to be translators and teachers. But not for those who are just wanting to practice.

As a practice, Dzogchen is a completely independent system; it has its own tantras and commentaries, its own set of outer preliminaries called the "seven mind trainings"; its own set of inner preliminaries called rushan and semzin, and its own main practices in the form of the four samadhis of Sems sde, the four symbols of klong sde, or the trekchö and tögal, etc., in man ngag sde. The central practice in Dzogchen is Ati Guru Yoga.

Beyond this, a Dzogchen practitioner may make use of whatever else is helpful for their practice. If that means going to Catholic Mass on Sundays, or going to a Kirtan, etc., or practicing a Tara sadhana, then that is fine.

As for myself, for many years I practiced Dzogchen practice side by side with Sakya practices, this is even true up until late last year. I had also put aside all formal practice between the periods of 1998-2001 and focused only on Guru Yoga and Tregchö. In 2001 I met some excellent Lamas like Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche, like Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, (whose termas I also received and from whom I received the Nyingthg Yabzhi) and so on, and practiced Konchog Chidu, Troma, etc., for a while. Then I reconnected with my root Guru, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu in 2002. (For me, ChNN and KDL are inseparable). Also I received Vajrayogini from HH Jetsun Kusho -- I practiced this for a few years. Now however I practice only Dzogchen according to the instructions of ChNN, KDL and other Dzogchen masters I have received instructions from. So that's it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Caz said:

And how it surpasses everything that was ever taught.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-Buddhist schools, as well as Hinayāna and Mahāyāna, are classified as vehicles of the cause.

The various levels of Vajrayāna are classified as vehicles of the result.

Dzogchen defines itself as the vehicle beyond cause and result. For this reason many Buddhists reject it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Will said:

Is it Buddhism that has 'sectarian limitations' or some Buddhists?

Are all Dzogchenpas free of 'sectarian limitations'?

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first question, it is the first alternative.

As to the second, no -- there are many people who turn Dzogchen into a school.

M

Will said:

I wonder how there can be 'Buddhism' without Buddhists?

Malcolm wrote:

As you well know will, some people will turn that which is free from limits into a limitation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Will said:

Is it Buddhism that has 'sectarian limitations' or some Buddhists?

Are all Dzogchenpas free of 'sectarian limitations'?

Malcolm wrote:

As to the first question, it is the first alternative.

As to the second, no -- there are many people who turn Dzogchen into a school.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 11:58 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State

Content:

Huifeng said:

Hi,

While I read some general books about Dzogchen years ago, finally got around to reading some more recently.

Just finished off Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche's Dzogchen: The Self-Perfected State. Nice entry point, I felt.

That's it. Thanks!

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Number two on intro books to Dzogchen. Crystal however is still required reading.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 8:28 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

The Dzogchen Tantras may not say all of this explicitly, but what I'm saying also does not contradict them.

Malcolm wrote:

They do, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

In which year(s) were those Termas and where discovered?

Forgot to ask what was the reason for concealment / hiding?

Malcolm wrote:

All we can say for certain is that Chetsun Senge Wangchuk had passed on the lineage and texts for the 17 tantras and the Vima Nyinthig by 1128.

We don't really know how old he was when he met Lhungyal nor how old he was when he achieved rainbow body.

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Do you eventual know the reason why these texts were hidden?

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

I assume it was because it was met with strong opposition by court Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 7:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

In which year(s) were those Termas and where discovered?

Forgot to ask what was the reason for concealment / hiding?

Malcolm wrote:

All we can say for certain is that Chetsun Senge Wangchuk had passed on the lineage and texts for the 17 tantras and the Vima Nyinthig by 1128.

We don't really know how old he was when he met Lhungyal nor how old he was when he achieved rainbow body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Anders Honore said:

Buddhism has its root and centre in the liberation of the mind.

Malcolm wrote:

One can say the same thing about many traditions. This is not a unique feature of Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: buddhahood that reverts to the basis

Content:

CapNCRunch said:

Are Dzogchen practitioners guaranteed to eventually attain the buddhahood that doesn't revert to the basis? Does this necessarily include the body of light?

Malcolm wrote:

If they practice

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 4:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Out of all who responded to my post, it looks like everyone except for Kalden Yungdrung missed this part:

However since the Buddha Shakyamuni is listed as one of the Twelve Dzogchen teachers, we could then say that the Buddha Dharma has Dzogchen roots.

The Dzogchen Tantras say that the Buddha Shakyamuni was one of the Twelve Dzogchen Teachers. If you don't agree with that, well then that's your choice. But as has been said a number of times in this very thread, if you don't agree with that then you could not on the same grounds say that Vajrayana (or maybe even Mahayana for that matter) has any more validity than Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Matylida said:

The same applies to dzogchen, isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

If you take Dzogchen as some intellectual school. Yes. But that is not Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Rheumatoid Arthritis

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you Malcolm. What are the recommendations for diet?

LunaRoja said:

Does the arthritis hurt more when it is cold or warm?

N

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely cold and humidity is very difficult. I don't eat dairy since that seems to exacerbate it so I was wondering if there is anything else I can either remove or add to my diet.

Thank you kindly for your help. A Tibetan Dr comes to town here every couple of years but she is usually booked up before she arrives. I have also tried accupinture which has been very helpful.[/quote]

I would recommend you do an ayurvedic cleanse and rekindle your digestive fire. You need to stay warm, eat only warm food, such as lamb, buffalo, with spices like pepper, cardamon, ginger, etc.:

diet for rheumatoid arthritis: Ayurvedic recommended food

Posted on January 13, 2011 by Dr J V Hebbar MD(Ayu)

In rheumatoid arthritis Ayurvedic treatment, diet plays an important role in improving the joint health and to keep control on swelling and pain. Since Ayurveda believes that the root cause of rheumatoid arthritis lies in impaired digestion and metabolism, the rheumatoid arthritis diet also targeted to improve the same.

Rheumatoid arthritis Ayurvedic diet:

Ayurveda advises to include following food items to be included in rheumatoid arthritis.

Garlic: Recent study states that the micro nutrients of garlic helps in preventing arthritis changes of bones.

Buttermilk: Curds is a food item to avoid, but buttermilk is good for Rheumatoid Arthritis.

Two garlic pearls with 2 ounces of buttermilk is an excellent daily drink and home remedy for rheumatoid arthritis.

Ginger, long pepper and pepper – These three help to correct digestion and metabolism, hence recommended for daily usage in rheumatoid arthritis patients.

Barley, horse gram: Both these are very easy to adopt in diet.

Bitter gourd (Bitter melon): It improves digestion, very low in calorie and good source of Vitamin B1, 2 & 3. It is a good detoxifying herb and is traditionally indicated in diet for rheumatoid arthritis.

Hot water: Hot water drinking is beneficial to improve digestion. Regular drinking of hot water helps to bring lightness to the joints and improves flexibility in Rheumatoid arthritis.

Food to avoid: While it is important to know what food is good, it is also important to know food to avoid in rheumatoid arthritis. It makes the complete rheumatoid arthritis diet plan.

<http://easyayurveda.com/2011/01/13/diet-for-rheumatoid-arthritis-ayurvedic-recommended-food/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We all have compassion. So the way to increase it is to simply see that we have it, and exercise that muscle a bit more.

M

LunaRoja said:

What is the difference between, exercising that muscle a bit more and cultivating compassion? They are both a conscious attempt to be more compassionate just worded differently.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhist approach always starts out by suggesting that everyone has a compassion deficit. I don't agree. Some people's compassion is not developed however even after years of Lam rim meditation. This is so easy to see.

So, I think a different approach is needed.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

Malcolm -this post has really brought forwards something that's I've been ruminating over for a while, mostly unconsciously. One thing I have found to be increasingly odd is that the Dzogchen teachings seem to be frequently put on a high shelf, as if to keep them out of the way of many people.

Malcolm wrote:

I think this condition exists because Buddhists in India, and then later in Tibet, were so hostile to Dzogchen when it was first revealed by Garab Dorje.

Since Vajrayāna emerged out in the context of the Yogatantra systems, and is not fundamentally at odds with the notion of cause and result in the terms of path theory in Buddhism in general, it never met with such a hostile reception.

Paul said:

There are many things that must often be done before a person is given instructions. A common attitude is that person must complete ngondro first, do many years of retreat, be adept at creation and completion etc. otherwise it's going to be too hard for a person to get any benefit at all. In some cases I've found that it's not seen as a good thing to even talk about Dzogchen. This seems frankly a little ridiculous and also counter productive as in my experience it can even damage a person's belief they can ever understand their nature experientially. In my opinion, with diligence and a good teacher it's pretty straight forwards.

Malcolm wrote:

There are lots of different ways to build golden cages.

Paul said:

Do you think that the 'sorry kid, it's too High and Special a teaching for you' stance that can be found in the orthodox Tibetan religious structure is a symptom of Dzogchen's problematic consequences to power structures - restricting it to only a few carefully selected groups? The part I've highlighted in bold above is a comment from you that makes me think I may be on the right lines.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it has more to do with the fact that Dzogchen tantras themselves utterly dismisses the cause/result approach to awakening; whereas Buddhism is heavily invested in the cause/result paradigm and has an entire intellectual and institutional edifice dedicated to preserving it at any cost. So therefore, the standard line you often get is "Dzogchen is

a practice for Buddhas...." and so on. Dzogchen tantras completely toss out the whole conditioned merit making thing on its ear, for example -- and this is not good for the enterprise of gilding statues. If you tell people they will never attain awakening through making donations to monasteries, they might think twice before giving at the office. Dzogchen goes much further than tathāgatagarbha theory. Vimalamitra states:

Hey, Son of a good family, listen up! The one who is "free from virtue and sin" in the conventions of the natural great perfection are yogis who see the meaning of their own vidyā. That vidyā is connected with the intimate instructions of the Guru. If that is not demonstrated, a scholarly paṇḍita trained in tripitika will not know even a fragment of a subtle particle split into one hundred thousand pieces of the meaning. That being so, it is called "depending on the method of secret mantra".

If demonstrated, since even a poor cowherd can see it, that being case it is called "without good and bad action".

If it is not practiced, even Vajrasattva will not be liberated. That being the case, it is called "familiarity with the intimate instruction meets its measure". If practiced, even one who has committed one of the five limitless actions can be liberated from this appearance. That being so, it is called "being unaffected by the benefit or harm of good and bad actions". Since it is impossible that a person who has committed the five limitless actions cannot be liberated if demonstrated in that way, it demonstrated that [vidyā] itself is not affected by sins. Since it is impossible even for Samantabhadra to be liberated if it is not demonstrated, it is demonstrated that there [vidyā] itself is protected by virtue. That being so, it is shown that there is no difference between five hundred butchers who have seen vidyā and Vajrasattva who has also seen vidyā.

The leveling of social, and therefore, spiritual hierarchies which are a mere reflection of the latter, is threatening to the traditional Buddhist political establishment. I cannot tell you the number of times of I have heard educated Lama laugh at the idea that yak herders could have realization. They should just recite the Mani is the general attitude of many educated Tibetan Lamas. This kind of Tantric elitism is much more pronounced in Sakya and Gelug of course.

Thus the tool of secrecy has been used two ways in Dzogchen teachings -- it has been used by the external establishment to keep the wraps on the radical teachings of Mahāmudra on the one hand, and Dzogchen on the other. The way it has been used by Dzogchen is to protect itself.

But this is no longer necessary so much. We live in a somewhat democratic, egalitarian society. Dzogchen teachings can really flourish under such circumstances. This is not to say there is not a proper way to introduce people to the teachings, there is of course. But in the end, they will flourish more widely than all the other traditions of the world. ChNN has predicted many times that Dzogchen teachings will flourish worldwide and that everyone will be affected by them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

I'm not talking about (just)myself. You have a large following here, and I am concerned that anything that looks like a subtle rejection of gradual methods can be misunderstood and do much harm.

Malcolm wrote:

I have stated over and over again, it is everyone's responsibility to discover for themselves what is useful.

mindyourmind said:

We are talking about important issues here, concepts that can be easily misunderstood. This fine line is one of the reasons why Dzogchen has been kept secret in the past, why it should only be approached when the student is ready.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason Dzogchen was kept secret in the past is because of the hostility it garnered from Buddhists since its inception. Now Dzogchen is out in the world, and it not within the clutches of Tibetan Buddhists anymore. This does not mean we can ignore things like transmission, lineage and so on. But it does mean that we can speak more freely to those who are interested in what the real point of view of Dzogchen is itself. And it is not the gradual system the Nyingmapas were forced to adopt to forstall criticisms of the Kadampa influenced hegemony.

mindyourmind said:

Another point I'm making is that Dzogchen itself (if such a monolithic view can ever be found)does not really consistently propose a sudden approach.

Malcolm wrote:

If by Dzogchen, we are referring to the what Dzogchen tantras themselves state quite clearly, then this is not correct.

If we are talking about how Dzogchen has been presented by the Nyingma school under intense pressure from its opponents, then it is true, Nyingma presents Dzogchen as a graduated path. But the point of view of the Nyingma school and the point of view of Dzogchen are not necessarily the same thing.

mindyourmind said:

We are also, in some of the discussions so far, on the verge of confusing whether compassion is inherent, and whether the methods to cultivate it, are sudden or gradual.

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahāyāna, as I stated, compassion is gradually cultivated over many lifetimes.

In Dzogchen, there is little need to "cultivate" compassion since compassion is recognized a) to be innate b) will be expanded up by recognizing your own state.

I know many Mahāyāna practitioners who cultivate compassion for many years, who are like rocks in the bottom of the ocean. They talk about compassion a lot, but never stop to help anyone or anything.

I know many non-buddhists who never "cultivated" compassion even once in their lives. But they are always helpful, without restraint.

I have little confidence in the canned meditations of the gradual system. They sure did not work for me when I was in retreat, so I abandoned them in favor of a more experiential approach. I just recognized that I had compassion, that I often acted compassionately, and then continued to move in the direction. I built on what I had, and expanded it -- rather than just sitting on my ass running through canned meditation topics. This is much better than sitting around with a Lam rim book in hand and practicing scales.

We all have compassion. So the way to increase it is to simply see that we have it, and exercise that muscle a bit more.

Then, when we recognize our true condition, our compassion will burst out like the sun behind a cloud.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhism

Content:

Huseng said:

Most of them seem to be pasting a cherry picked version of Buddhism elements onto a default base of materialist ideology and narrative. If you're born and raised in a 1st world country, chances are you believe in materialism as the default worldview by virtue of it being the state sanctioned view. To deviate from it is not so comforting to many.

Malcolm wrote:

The religion of the state is only power. Always has been, always will be. Power reduces everything to mere things to be used. That is the real materialism we should worry about.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 21st, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

Thank you very much, Malcolm. That's sorted a lot of things out for me and I see exactly where you are coming from. I can also see why many religious institutions have reacted badly to the Dzogchen teachings - it seems to be something that could act as an aqua regia to any formal power structure.

Karma Dorje said:

Except aqua regia was used to hide gold in something corrosive. This would be concealing something corrosive in gold.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess the intent of the metaphor was to indicate a solvent that other things are incapable of dissolving.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

Banned said:

Virupa's back lineage is actually Mahamudra isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Virupa realized Mahāmudra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As you probably know, I was a Sakya practitioner for many years.

N

Matylda said:

So did you give up sakya? In favor of ChNNR?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I did not give up Sakya. But ChNN has been my primary root guru since 1992.

I unify, I don't abandon.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

If even the Lonchen Nyingtig contains a graduated method (and gradual realization) then we should accept that instantaneous vs gradual depends on a lot of things, such as the practitioner's abilities and so on. There is no right and wrong way. The development of compassion needs all the help it can get.

Jigme Lingpa himself is said to have favored a gradual approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Mym:

It all depends on how fast you want that compassion express itself fully, rapidly or slowly.

If you are convinced that you need gradual methods, then there is no point trying to tell you otherwise. It is best to impart to you those methods. If you wish to practice Dzogchen, then compassion is inherent in the path without needing copious amounts of cultivation. Compassion is released merely from recognizing your true condition.

Really.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So you are saying that true compassion only arises via pointing out? Is that why everybody here has devoted their lives to voluntarily assisting lepers in Bangladesh?

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that unlimited compassion arises from recognizing your real nature. I also said that compassion was innate and everyone has it.

gregkavarnos said:

The question was directed towards Sonams statement. I am not saying that compassion is not innate, but if one recognises their real nature via pointing out or via a gradual didactic approach is ultimately irrelevant. What is bizarre to me is to consider didactic approaches "contrived" in contrast to instantaneous approaches as uncontrived. True compassion, whether it is arrived at (realised) gradually through Lojong/Lam Rim practices or whether arrived at instantaneously through pointing out can never be contrived. Pretending to be compassionate is contrived. (Yes, I know you said this, I'm just repeating it for others sake).

Back to the walking example: you gotta fall over and bruise yourself a number of times before you can walk.

This is apparent even in the direct introduction approach coz seeing it once is not enough. You lose sight, then you see it again, then... until it is stabilised. Thus it is obviously as contrived (or uncontrived) as having it taught to you.

And back to the leper example, I am sure mother Theresa did not have a Dzogchen master point out her innate compassion to her, not in this lifetime anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg,

I am not talking about true compassion versus contrived.

No one needs to meditate on compassion for hours and days. of course, cultivating the four immeasurables is a good thing, but do you know what its function really is? Accumulating merit. Now this is not bad, of course. But what results from accumulating merit? Just a better body in samsara, that's all.

When we see suffering, we respond with empathy, unless we are a twisted f#ck.

What I was talking about was the difference between bound compassion and boundless compassion.

We all have bound compassion. Boundless compassion only comes from discovering our real nature. In Mahāyāna, this may mean cultivating compassion in a meaningful way through many kinds of practices. Of course, if someone wants to do that, that is fantastic -- who does not want people in the world who are more compassionate?

The problem with Mahāyāna is that this kind of cultivation takes eons.

But if you wish to have boundless compassion without waiting eons, then it is better for you to go to a Dzogchen master or a Mahāmudra master, receive introduction and

discover your real nature as fast as possible.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: buddhahood that reverts to the basis

Content:

trevor said:

So all those beings that have not achieved budhahood through the Dzogche doctrine will have to cycle in samsara again at the end of the dark eon?

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. What happens is, the best I understand is, is that while their consciousnesses are liberated, they have not completely eradicated all traces from the elements, and therefore, this unresolved contamination causes the latent awareness in the basis to arise from the movement of vāyu in the basis. When this neutral awareness recognizes its own state, it becomes prajñā, when it does not, it becomes ignorance. Just to be clear, this latent awareness of the basis is not a unified field, it is relative and differentiated. Thus, even though all sentient beings achieve liberation, sentient beings are not somehow newly created.

Sentient beings are just nexus of affliction, nothing more.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Jikan said:

Finally: thank you, Malcolm, for describing your understanding to us. I for one greatly appreciate it.

Malcolm wrote:

You are welcome, Dan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Jikan said:

If, as Malcolm suggests, a Sufi or Christian or Hindu Dzogchen might be possible... what

might a Tendai Dzogchen look like? I don't know: I'm just proposing it as a thought experiment (or in my case, a life experiment)

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Buddhist Dzogchen or Bonpo Dzogchen. This why there cannot be a Hindu Dzogchen, a Sufu Dzogchen, a Christian Dzogchen, or a Tendai Dzogchen, a Zen Dzogchen.

Dzogchen does not belong to a school. There is no school of Dzogchen. A Dzogchen school would not be Dzogchen. This would be a completely wrong approach.

But anyone from any school or traditon who would like to learn Dzogchen can come and learn Dzogchen from a qualified teacher.

For example, the lineage of Dzogchen at this juncture in time appears in Buddhism and Bon. This does not make Dzogchen Buddhist and Bonpo. Dzogchen is the essence of the teachings, all teachings. When we do Ati Guru Yoga, we unify all the knowledge we learned from any teacher, be they Buddhist, Bon, Hindu, Christian, Sufi, etc.

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, you must go beyond the limitations of schools. In the context of Tibetan culture, the rimey movement was started by Dzogchen practitioners. Why? Because they understood the need to go beyond the limitations of schools and discover the essence of the teachings. Now Dzogchen, the jewel of Tibetan culture, has left the confines of Tibeian culture. We must go beyond the limitations of all schools, all philosophies, all ideologies if we are to practice Dzogchen.

As human beings, we have too much to lose if we continue to remain limited by religion, ideology, class, race and tribe. Yesterday, ChNN strongly stated that every human being should learn Dzogchen and put these teachings into practice. And if every human being did this, we would have much less problems in the world.

I cannot say the same thing about Buddhism. Why? Because the very first opponents of Dzogchen were Buddhists! And Buddhists remained hostile to Dzogchen for centuries.

We human beings like our niches, our cages we build for ourselves, the limitations in which we place ourselves. We justify those limitations, and create many arguments for them. I suggest that people look at that. I have, and I have found these wanting, and unnecessary.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Requirements to give empowerments?

Content:

Caz said:

The story of the dogs tooth is a perfect example of how someones faith transformed the perceived object.

Malcolm wrote:

The dogs tooth story is a perfect example of how unscrupulous sons dupe their mothers naive faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

zerwe said:

...

Realizing that the example of the kind mother is the source of compassion

Sönam said:

I'm not shure it's a good exemple ... it's most often an exemple of egoism, centered on herself, HER kid.

Sönam

zerwe said:

Sönam, I can see your point. However, if we are describing it as innate the only worldly example we have

of love and compassion is in the "mother." It would seem that it is through this example of the mother, developing compassion for oneself through recognizing our own suffering,

and turning this gradually toward others that we can realize our own true nature.

Shaun

Malcolm wrote:

The reason that compassion is said to lead to profound realization in Mahāyāna is that gradual cultivation of compassion in an authentic way can lead to seeing the absence of identity in phenomena. This perfectly fine and wonderful.

Even more wonderful is the recognition of our real condition that unleashes the tap of compassion spontaneously.

Buddhahood does not come about because of engaging in the conditioned benefit of sentient beings. When you fully integrate with your real conditions, since compassion is innate in the basis, the needs of sentient beings are automatically satisfied.

This at least is the Dzogchen view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Rheumatoid Arthritis

Content:

LunaRoja said:

How does Tibetan Medicine treat flares of Rheumatoid arthritis especially in the joints in the fingers and hands?

Malcolm wrote:

Medicinal baths, herbs, bloodletting/moxa (depending on cause), diet.

LunaRoja said:

Thank you Malcolm. What are the recommendations for diet?

Malcolm wrote:

Does the arthritis hurt more when it is cold or warm?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

LunaRoja said:

How does it differ from the Kagyu school?

Malcolm wrote:

Mainly it is just difference in lineage. Result is the same.

N

LunaRoja said:

There are philosophical difference since Sapan did not believe in the pointing out instructions...

Malcolm wrote:

Sure he did, he just felt is needed to be based on having already received the four full empowerments.

Sapan did not accept sutra mahāmudra as such -- but he opined that Mahāmudra could be realized through either the two stages or through Guru Yoga.

LunaRoja said:

but thought the great seal depended on initiation into a full Mandala. Sapan thought Mahamudra was totally free of concepts but criticized Gampopa's Mahamudra as just creating greater clarity and calm. He considered any sutra based non-tantric great seal to be impossible. Mahamudra in Sakya is depended on complete initiation into the Hevajra tantra. Now the Tsarpa Sakya I have been told do believe in pointing out instructions, but in general the Ngor and Khon lineages do not. So those are the major differences that I am aware of.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayogini has had a mahāmudra pointing out instruction from the beginning. It is in Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen's collected works. Therefore, the Ngor and Khon Lineages accept pointing out.

As you probably know, I was a Sakya practitioner for many years.

As for the distinction between the inseparability of clarity of the three visions and emptiness and sutra mahāmudra, this is just fighting over a name. The meaning of the two is the completely identical.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 7:43 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Regarding the next closed webcast for Longsal Longde, if we have an immediate family member who wants to attend with us, yet who is not yet a Dzogchen Community member and would not be able to join in time; would this be permissible? Or is this something that we would have to try to ask Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche?

Malcolm wrote:

It would be permissible if they are truly interested.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So you are saying that true compassion only arises via pointing out? Is that why

everybody here has devoted their lives to voluntarily assisting lepers in Bangladesh?

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that unlimited compassion arises from recognizing your real nature. I also said that compassion was innate and everyone has it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:24 PM

Title: Re: Rheumatoid Arthritis

Content:

LunaRoja said:

How does Tibetan Medicine treat flares of Rheumatoid arthritis especially in the joints in the fingers and hands?

Malcolm wrote:

Medicinal baths, herbs, bloodletting/moxa (depending on cause), diet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

zerwe said:

It would not seem to be innate, but something that must be developed.

Malcolm wrote:

It is innate, but because of not recognizing the absence of identity, it's scope is limited.

If you want your compassion to be free from limitations, the only way to do that is to recognize your own state.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:19 PM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

LunaRoja said:

It is not the same as Kagyu Mahamudra I thought it was from the unique point of view of the 3 Visions.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is one of the three tantras, the result tantra.

Sutra Mahāmudra = union of clarity and emptiness

Tantric mahāmudra = the result tantra

Essence mahāmudra = the inseparability of samsara and nirvana

LunaRoja said:

How does it differ from the Kagyu school?

Malcolm wrote:

Mainly it is just difference in lineage. Result is the same.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:43 AM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

LunaRoja said:

It is not the same as Kagyu Mahamudra I thought it was from the unique point of view of the 3 Visions.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is one of the three tantras, the result tantra.

Sutra Mahāmudra = union of clarity and emptiness

Tantric mahāmudra = the result tantra

Essence mahāmudra = the inseparability of samsara and nirvana

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 11:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

Content:

Banned said:

My understanding is that Virupa's lineage descends from Mahamudra.

Is Lamdre just a branch of Mahamudra?

LunaRoja said:

No it is much deeper than that it is the path and the fruit, the indivisible nature of Samsara and Nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

The result of Lamdre is mahāmudra. It is not deeper than mahāmudra.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

Ok if you say so!

Malcolm wrote:

It is simple, when you see suffering, do you have compassion or not? Did that compassion come about because you spent lots of time sitting thinking about your kind mother, etc....? No, probably not. It came about because compassion is a natural part of our state and when we witness suffering, we are empathetic.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: shilajit

Content:

Pero said:

So, who normally takes it? Is it addictive?

Malcolm wrote:

Shilajit enhances the potency of other medicines. No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Requirements to give empowerments?

Content:

Luke said:

What traditionally are the requirements that a lama has to fulfill in order for him or her to be able to give empowerments to other people?

Have any living western lamas fulfilled these requirements?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to have permission of your Lama. For example, when I received the

transmission of Troma Nagpo from Kayprok Tulku, a Sherpa Lama was was one of Trulshik Rinpoche's best friends from childhood, when he concluded the empowerment, he told us that he had given it in the most complete way so that if we ever needed to bestow the empowerment, we could. Granted, this means that one has to learn a considerable number of things, but you see how it is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mirage said:

Anyway, I am not really interested in discussing it, just expressing my feelings. Don't mind me.

Malcolm wrote:

I am drawing a distinction between aritificially contrived compassion, the kind of "mouth" compassion and bodhicitta that drips out of the mouths of Buddhist teachers and students alike (while they screw their students, steal money, manipulate each other and so on) and real compassion that stems from recognizing one's actual state and the resulting automatic responsive concern for those sentient beings who do not recognize their own nature.

LunaRoja said:

All compassion is contrived until one reaches a realized state. In the causal vehicles contrived compassion leads to absolute compassion or in terms of the non-causals schools it results in removing the obscurations to realizing one's natural state. I thought this is why we practiced compassion (contrived) until it is actualized.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is the gradualist party line. I think it is really just disempowering. Compassion is part of your state. Just let it go free.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mirage said:

Anyway, I am not really interested in discussing it, just expressing my feelings. Don't mind me.

Malcolm wrote:

I am drawing a distinction between aritificially contrived compassion, the kind of "mouth" compassion and bodhicitta that drips out of the mouths of Buddhist teachers and students alike (while they screw their students, steal money, manipulate each other and so on) and real compassion that stems from recognizing one's actual state and the resulting automatic responsive concern for those sentient beings who do not recognize their own nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm - some people see a rainbow and think that it exists. Look at the illusion of the internet if you are not sure how it is that people fixate illusions. I'm not trying to be argumentative for the sake of it. Emptiness is simple but not that simple.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why there are eight examples of illusion, and not just one.

But it is sufficient, Rongton Sheja Kunrig refers to this as the upadesha lineage of Madhyamaka. Longchen wrote a whole book about them.

The examples of illusion are all that someone interested in Dzogchen needs to know about emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Why is it sufficient to merely reflect on the examples of illusion to understand emptiness?

Malcolm wrote:

Because that is all that is necessary for anyone to understand emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Are you a nicer person? I do not mean are you a more "compassionate" person in that syrupy fake Lam rim way.

M

LunaRoja said:

This statement seems a little unfair to our Lam Rim friends. I have met some wonderfully compassionate Lam Rim students and some very grouchy Dzogchenpas. As far as compassion goes one of the most compassionate people I've met in my life is a Roman Catholic. I really think the nonsectarian approach is best. There are great fruits in all the schools and religions.

Sincerely,

LR

Malcolm wrote:

Put emphasis on fake, then you will understand my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Institutional Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

Thank you very much, Malcolm. That's sorted a lot of things out for me and I see exactly where you are coming from. I can also see why many religious institutions have reacted badly to the Dzogchen teachings - it seems to be something that could act as an aqua regia to any formal power structure.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the archtypal bad reaction is when "500" Nalanda panditas travelled to Oḍḍiyāna to bully an 8 year old kid when they heard he was teaching that liberation was beyond cause and result. We know the rest of that story.

Tibetan power structures have been trying to keep the lid on Dzogchen ever since it entered into Tibet. Vairocana was banned to Eastern Tibet by a spurned queen and ministers who did not approve of Dzogchen. For example the 11th century translator Go Khugpa Lhatse accuses Vairocana of forging the five sems sde lungs, accuses Nubchen of forging the smad du byung wa, and exorciates Aro Yeshe Jungney for composed defiled compositions connected to sems sde, etc. The fourteenth century master, Buton accuses Guru Chowang (the treasure revealer of the seven line prayer) of being a fraud, dimisses symbolic dakini script as ridiculous, states outright that Dzogchen teachings are the indepedent fabrications of Nyingmapas. Indeed this was the standard

attitude towards Dzogchen, etc. for centuries in Tibet. This is actually at the root of the whole Shugden controversy.

To make it worse, the Nyingmapas, eventually cowed by this pressure to conform to the Sutrayāna gradualism politically enforced by King Trisong Detsen after the outcome of the three year exchange of letters called "the Samye debate", gradually began to present Dzogchen as the summit of a gradual path, abandoning the earliest presentation of Dzogchen as a independent vehicle. There are some people enamored of scholars like Sam Van Schaik, a Sakyapa, who specializes in Dunhuang material. Now, he is a good scholar, and I like very much his point of view. But in my opinion, he has completely misunderstood the intent of the early Dzogchen tradition in Tibet. He presents Dzogchen based on the man ngag lta ba phreng ba (MTP), attributed to Padmasambhava and widely accepted to be his work even in Gelug. As you know or can find out, the MTP presents Dzogchen as the culmination phase of the creation and completion phase based on the Guhyagarbha tantra. Now there is nothing wrong with this at all. But this is not how Dzogchen is presented either in the Seventeen Tantras, klong sde or sems sde. For example, Nubchen, writing in the late 9th century clearly shows that Dzogchen is not merely a completion stage for Dzogchen in his bsam brtan mig gron [SMG]. he identifies Dzogchen as a cig char system. Not only this, but he defends Chan as being the definitive sutrayāna approach because it too is a cig char system. He says for example:

"Do not seek out a philosophical position [siddhanta], there is also nothing to illustrate, if there is something to illustrate, the non-dual is illustrated to be free from activity, thought, or analysis through an example."

But here on this thread, we have many people voice the opinion, to understand Dzogchen you need madhyamaka either Rang stong or gzhan stong, you need to have the view of dependent origination, etc. All kinds of preconditions but one, the indispensable one.

There is but one thing indispensable for Dzogchen, and that is an introduction from a master. As Nubchen points out this is the critical difference between sutra and tantra. The critical difference between tantra and Dzogchen is whether one's practice is based on the notion of cause and result or not. And that is based on whether or not one has authentically recognized one's own stage so that one is possession of that famous rigpa.

Some people are interested in how we know if our practice is moving ahead. It is easy -- are you more integrated, are you having less problems in life? Is your clarity increasing? Are you a nicer person? I do not mean are you a more "compassionate" person in that syrupy fake Lam rim way. I mean are you a nicer person? A decent, ordinary, normal human being who plays well with others? Or are you still an alienated freak who can't get along with anyone and always demands that everyone around you change in conformity with your own neurosis, especially your religious neurosis?

How can anyone say incidentally these are merely features of a Buddhist path? Look at all the basket cases in Buddhism. Do we really think we have our shit together more

than Hindus, Christians and so on? I don't think so -- incidentally I am not making a claim that people who are interested in Dzogchen necessarily are more together, I have met a lot of flakes in and out of the community and there are a lot of people who think I am a flake. But most people like me even if they think I shoot my mouth off too much (I do).

Back to the main topic: the notion of a vehicle beyond cause and result, one that does not require accumulations, practice with effort, and so on is very threatening to the gradualist establishment in Tibetan culture. The gradualists really hate the message of Atiyoga. It threatens their grip on feudal power. This is why Dzogchen will not be found in Tibetan monasteries and large Dharma centers. It will only be found at the feet of Dzogchen masters. You can take a hundred high Dzogchen empowerments but if you do not understand the main point, then it is of limited benefit. But if you can put yourself at the feet of qualified master who teaches Dzogchen from their own experience then there is no limit of benefit and you will receive transmission whether you are a Buddhist, an Catholic or an Alien. Transmission is beyond mind. Dzogchen is beyond mind, a personal experience beyond reckoning, calculation, something within the reach of everyone who is interested to discover their own nature. So yes, Dzogchen is an aqua regia, a royal water capable of dissolving all limitations whatsoever if one just puts it into sincere practice.

Some people are very attached to the Buddhist clothes in which they find Dzogchen. Those clothes are not so important. Dzogchen texts are relative so they reflect the culture of those they find themselves in. The principle of the three kāyas is beyond language, so it does not matter at all what you call your three kāyas. The three kāyas just express aspects of the wisdom of the basis.

In fact if you closely examine Dzogchen language you see that it uses non-Buddhist examples all the time. For example. the notion of the peacock feather's colors being naturally formed is actually drawn from the Carvaka India materialist school -- they use that example to prove there is no creator, and so do we. A peacocks feather has eyes just because it is the nature of a peacock's feather to have eyes. Wisdom exists in the heart of each and every sentient beings just because it is the nature of a sentient being to have wisdom in each and everyone's heart. We don't have to do anything to create that wisdom. We don't have to do anything at all to develop that wisdom. We cannot improve that wisdom or harm it in anyway. It is as integral to our state as the five elements from which we are made (since they are made from it, anyway).

If we want to understand emptiness in Dzogchen, we do not need to engage in any analysis at all -- we need to merely reflect on the examples of illusion -- that is sufficient for understanding everything is unreal -- no analysis required, no fancy Madyamaka analysis, we don't even have to use the word "emptiness", "Life is but a dream...." In this way we penetrate to the real essence of the teachings.

And then we rest in our own state, or we discover it. These are the only choices we have in Dzogchen, discover, then rest.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

pemachophel said:

In any case, knowing what I know about Kyabje Chatral Rinpoche, I find the previous respondents hypothesis unlikely.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is certainly true that for many Buddhist masters of Dzogchen declaring a religious allegiance to Buddhism is a very important first step with all that entails i.e. eschewing non-Buddhist gods and companions, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

In Dzogchen a persona has to discover rigpa, which is the point where concepts collapse and wisdom arises. A person's beliefs - such as being a Nyingmapa for example - is actually just a bunch of concepts. So from the Dzogchen POV (i.e. the experience of actually resting steadily in rigpa) it's actually false and as equally false as any other belief. There's no such thing as a 'more correct dream' - there's only waking up.

Malcolm wrote:

Check.

Paul said:

In order to fully integrate everything a Dzogchen practitioner cannot pick and choose. As you mention it's the path of not changing anything - i.e. not accepting and not rejecting. So if a person is going to practice, they have to 'eat whatever's on their plate', but the corollary is that as long as they are remaining in the liberated state that their teacher pointed out they can eat whatever they like. And it actually helps deepen their practice to have a varied diet - their capacity grows and limitations dwindle.

Malcolm wrote:

Check.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm - thanks. Would you equate real knowledge of instant presence to something like 'stream-enterer' in Theravada? I mean in the sense of the knowledge of instant presence having with it a quality that liberates and that does not degenerate?

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you could say something like that i.e. a Dzogchen stream entrant is someone who has discovered their real state.

The difference of course is that discovering your real condition does not mean you are liberated from what buddhists call "fetters" and hindus call samskaras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm I hope you are right. How many members of the Dzogchen Community do you think have achieved this liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really know where they keep those sorts of statistics. But I am very certain that many of our sibs have real knowledge of instant presence. So I do not worry so much. Some of whom in which I have personal confidence.

M

Andrew108 said:

Hi Malcolm - do you mean by 'sibs' those that have studied and completed SMS level 1?

Malcolm wrote:

I mean those who have received transmission and applied themselves in a serious fashion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

But didn't you debate for the "Aryan invasion theory" in the other thread about Hindu and Buddhist Deities? A 'theory' that if true, would show the Dravidian culture to be the bedrock of Indian civilization. If this is true, it of course does not necessarily negate Sanskrit as a 'Primordial' or 'Sacred' language.

Malcolm wrote:

Indian Civilization as we know it is based on the Vedas, first and foremost regardless of the AIT or the Hindutva theories of history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Malcolm I hope you are right. How many members of the Dzogchen Community do you think have achieved this liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really know where they keep those sorts of statistics. But I am very certain that many of our sibs have real knowledge of instant presence. So I do not worry so much. Some of whom in which I have personal confidence.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

pemachophel said:

It's clear that one can practice Dzogchen as a stand-alone system. It is also clear that one can practice Dzogchen along with whatever practices ones chooses/one's Guru chooses for them from the other eight yanas. Most Nyingma Lamas alive today (such as Kyabje Chatral Rinpoche) and those recently deceased (such as Kyabje Dudjom Rinpoche, Kyabje Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche, Kyabje Trulshik Rinpoche, Urgyen Kusum Lingpa, etc.) make/made pretty heavy use of the other eight yanas both for Themselves and Their students. IMO, since everything depends on the Guru, the right approach or mix depends on one's Guru's instructions and example and the student's faith and devotion to their Teacher(s). The report card comes at the time of death. Since most Baby Boomer practitioners will be dying in the next 20 years, we should have ample evidence of which approaches produce the most consistent or dependable results. Till then, may all of us on this forum practice according to our Guru(s) instructions as diligently as possible and may all of us bring the path to fruition as quickly as possible.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing to disagree with there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Alternatives for the Dzogchenpa

Content:

Sherlock said:

Malcolm once said that if you received the teachings from ChNN and did the practice daily (I assume guru yoga?) he guarantees that you will face no difficulties upon death. I'd also be curious to know his answer.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Yes, but we don't exactly know much about the history of the klong sde lineage before the 11th century? But we know it been a part of the klong sde lineage for almost 1000 years so that seems like something, at least to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Sure we do, we know the name of each master, who attained rainbow body, etc.

When Dzin Dharmabodhi combined klong sde with the practice of Ngondzog Gyalpo, he did so because Ngondzog Gyalpo taught the klong sde tantras. Ngondzog Gyalpo is a guru sadhana from anuyoga. So we do this practice to connect with the lineage, just as we do Guru Yoga of White A to connect with Garab Dorje, but that is also from Anuyoga system, it is not Dzogchen.

N

heart said:

Yes, but they are not exactly historically verified yet, even if I am sure they will be eventually. But the last 1000 years are of a historically verified lineage, that is worth something. But I think I heard ChNNR call the Guru Yoga with a White Ah a Ati Guru Yoga, no?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are three versions of this. What I am talking about is "A dkar bla ma'i rnal sbyor" it is a text with visualization of Garab Dorje, in the collective practices book.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 20th, 2012 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

.....All that is necessary for liberation is direct introduction and subsequent diligence applying that introduction.

M

Andrew108 said:

Are you really sure about this...

Do you really think this happens?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

xabir said:

But I do not see how a person can awaken and then still hold on to their old beliefs and views or their religions, since they would have seen through the views of their old religions. Even a stream enterer has ended three fetters: self-view, sceptical doubt and attachment to precepts and practices.

heart said:

Recognizing your own nature is not the same as realization except for a select few. I assume that is what you mean with awaken.

/magnus

xabir said:

Yes, in my understanding based on what I have read on ChNNR's texts and Namdrol's explanation, recognising Instant Presence is not equivalent to realizing emptiness and so does not have the effect of ending the fetters.

Malcolm wrote:

No, then there is something to do with that instant presence. No one said, "oh now I have recognized my real nature, now I am done."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

xabir said:

It is impossible to continue holding on to a view of self and at the same time be liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

It is impossible to hold onto a view of self or non-self and at the same time be liberated.

xabir said:

But I do not see how a person can awaken and then still hold on to their old beliefs and views or their religions, since they would have seen through the views of their old religions. In other words they can be a non-Buddhist up to the point of their awakening.

Malcolm wrote:

You still have not grasped the principle of "not changing anything". That means you integrate with wherever you find yourself. If you recognize your real condition while belonging to the Christian religion, you do not suddenly have to stop going to church. Maybe you like going to church. Maybe, being a Dzogchen practitioner makes a _better_ Christian.

Maybe being a Dzogchen practitioner can make Buddhists better Buddhists because Buddhists quite frankly are really grumpy and narrow minded, just like anyone else caught in the grip of grasping one-sided views. I can say this because I have more experience of Buddhists. Maybe, being a Dzogchen practitioner can make a Dzogchenpa a better Dzogchenpa.

An example of using old beliefs and views while still awakening is Bon. Bon did not throw anything out. They still teach their egg cosmology along with another more modern, "Buddhist" cosmology. They divide all that "non-Buddhist stuff" and call it all "The causal vehicle", right where the sgar thal gyur places the vehicle of gods and men i.e.:

Causal vehicles:

Gods and men

Hināyāna

Mahāyanā

Result vehicles:

kriya

upa
yoga
mahā
anu

Vehicle beyond cause and result
Ati.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:29 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

heart said:
Yes, but we don't exactly know much about the history of the klong sde lineage before the 11th century? But we know it been a part of the klong sde lineage for almost 1000 years so that seems like something, at least to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Sure we do, we know the name of each master, who attained rainbow body, etc.

When Dzin Dharmabodhi combined klong sde with the practice of Ngondzog Gyalpo, he did so because Ngondzog Gyalpo taught the klong sde tantras. Ngondzog Gyalpo is a guru sadhana from anuyoga. So we do this practice to connect with the lineage, just as we do Guru Yoga of White A to connect with Garab Dorje, but that is also from Anuyoga system, it is not Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:16 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:
you don't have practice with Anuyoga Deities or do Guardian Practices in Dzogchen, although it can help to do so.

heart said:
Depends on what you mean with that but Ekajati is a Dzogchen protector and there is a

Dzogchen Tantra on her practice, can't recall the name. Similarly I have been told some other deities appear in the Dzogchen Tantra's as practices. The empowerment of the Dzogchen Longde is for a deity and the Longde contains also lot of deity practice. Also Garab Dorje received all the Dzogchen teachings from Vajrasattva, who is a deity. So it is not so clean cut as I used to think. Of course the main point of all Dzogchen teachings is the realization of the natural state, but at least I think that could be said about Buddhism or rather the Dharma as a whole.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The addition of the empowerment for the Anuyoga style Guru Yoga of the primordial master Ngondzong Gyalpo was tacked onto the klong sde lineage in the 11th century by Dzin Dharmabodhi. Before that, there was no specific empowerment of klong sde.

Vajrasattva is one of Garab Dorje's names. For example, if you read the Rigpa Rangshar tantra, the master who teaches that Tantra is Zhonnu Pawo Tobden -- during the course the tantra, he is called Mahavajradhara, Samantabhadra, Vajrasattva and many other names and title. Any fully awakened person is the manifestation of all three kāyas.

Garab Dorje's Speech is Vajrasattva. His Mind is Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Tarpa said:

I have one question, do you think liberation is possible in other religions without the teaching of dependent origination ?

Malcolm wrote:

I understand why you ask this because it is strong statement I have made in the past.

But the view of Dzogchen is not dependent origination at all. Dependent origination, in Dzogchen, is how we describe the arising of afflicted phenomena in Dzogchen, the phenomena that manifest out of non-recognition of our real nature.

Tarpa said:

I understand a direct experience surpasses any need for intellectual study of anything, like reading a map after you've already arrived at a destination and since our real nature is inherent than of course it would be accessible to anybody able to recognize it, which is a wonderful thing of course, but do you think study of dependent origination and the wisdom teachings of Buddhism necessary for liberation ?

Malcolm wrote:

As I said in the first post in this thread, all that I think is necessary for studying Dzogchen is understanding the five elements and three gates and having a good motivation. All that is necessary for liberation is direct introduction and subsequent diligence applying that introduction. Of course one can study anything and it can be helpful and useful to broadening one's understanding, so if you read my first post, you will see what I said. If you are going to be a teacher, you have to study a little more broadly in order to relate to more diverse capacities.

Tarpa said:

Are you saying all other religions or whatever people want to call them can be looked at as stepping stones to an ultimate experience of one's real nature (which of course there is no label there saying "welcome to Buddhism you've made it" or anything like that), or looked at like part of the staircase of the gradual teachings, is what "the paths of gods and men mean"? It's okay they don't have understanding of dependent origination for now they are starting off in a good direction? But wouldn't eternalist and solid self / soul / reality views etc. be a problem?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, it does not matter much what your intellectual view is.

For example, no matter whether you are a cittamātrīn or a madhyamaka you can still attain liberation if you follow the the sādhanā method. Why? Because the sādhanā method in Vajrayāna recapitulates the experiential introduction in the third and fourth empowerments. The "view" in Vajrayāna in general is not a result of intellectual analysis, it is a result of introduction and the experiential cultivation of introduction. If it does not matter whether you are a cittamātrīn or a madhyamaka when it comes to practicing sādhanā -- because you will still attain liberation either way. Your post-meditation view will not interfere with your sādhanā practice. Since cittamātra is a realist view and it does not interfere with your liberation when practicing a vajrayāna sādhanā, why should other realist views interfere with your liberation?

Dzogchen is based completely on direct introduction. As long as you are willing to employ its methods, then what does it matter if you come to Dzogchen practice believing in Jesus, Buddha, Krishna, etc.? What does it matter if you believe in Parātmā? What does it matter if you believe in tathāgatagarbha which is described in so many tathāgatagarbha texts as a self (though, perish the thought, not the SAME self as advocated by the Hindus -- actually, if someone is really, really honest with themselves, they will admit it is impossible to differentiate the sat cit ananda of the Hindus from the atman, sukha, nitya, śuddha of the uttarantra)? The Dzogchen view is not a view, it is the experience of a moment of uncontrived awareness aka instant presence (an Indian moment i.e. roughly about 5 milliseconds) based on direct introduction.

As long as you are practicing Ati guru yoga etc., and doing your best, none of your previous conditioning, whether non-Buddhist or Buddhist will interfere with your liberation. Why? Because "liberation" is solely based on recognizing your real condition. It is not based on belief philosophy, intellectual analysis, conditioned merit, or anything else. It is not based on having a view of emptiness, dependent origination,

buddhanature, etc. These views are just as relative as views of self, a creator, and so on.

Tarpa said:

I think I'd like to finally start getting into dzogchen, I have read a bunch of books about dzogchen but no actual dzogchen books per se, texts, I have been putting it off for years because I found it a bit confusing while studying mahamudra after experienced practitioners such as yourself were saying it is not the same thing while all the intro books about buddhism were saying it was, then I got the sense that maybe trekcho and mahamudra are more or less same but togal is something completely different than anything elsewhere, and terms and definitions seemed to be different in both systems so I didn't want to confuse myself and decided to study one or the other and picked mahamudra. Togal is mainly what I'm interested in learning about.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, start with klong sde. Listen to ChNN retreat coming up, it is closed, so you have to get your membership and the login right away. starts very soon, like thursday or something.

Tarpa said:

I think I'll join the dzogchen community.

Malcolm wrote:

Good call.

Tarpa said:

I'm a Buddhist and will always cherish it...

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have to change anything to be a Dzogchen practitioner. If you are a Catholic, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Buddhist because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner and you can still partake of the Sacraments of the church as much as you like, just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a Wiccan, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Buddhist because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner. If you want dance naked under the moon during during a sabbat, there is no problem, just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a religious Jew, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Buddhist because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner, you can still observe the sabbath, there is no problem, just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a Taoist, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Buddhist because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner, when you practice Taoist rites and so on, just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a Buddhist, you don't suddenly have to change and call yourself a Dzogchen practitioners because you have become a Dzogchen practitioner, when you practice meditation, sadhana, etc., just do so with presence and awareness.

If you are a Dzogchen practitioner, and all of sudden you don't feel very much like you

need the label "Catholic, Wiccan, Jew, Taoist, Buddhist" there is also no problem. Just continue to practice Dzogchen and be present and aware.

Some people think I have abandoned Dharma. It is not true. My relationship to Dharma and my understanding of it has changed. As I mentioned before all Dharma paths, whether Buddhist or non-Buddhist, have the same motivation, the peace and happiness that comes from freedom.

I just don't feel the need to self-identify as a "buddhist" anymore. I am personally finding the label "buddhist" to be a limitation for me. I am not suggesting to anyone else that they need to change anything.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Tarpa said:

Does receiving Dzogchen related hyt empowerments (protectors) with ati yoga version sadhanas, yangzab lineage / Traga Rinpoche, count as direct introduction or entry on Dzogchen path ?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. Yangzab is an Anuyoga system. Traga Rinpoche is a Dzogchen master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 11:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Dzogchen has no tradition. Dzogchen is beyond tradition"

ChNN 5/18/2012

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We find four main kinds of conflict narratives in Tibeian religious culture

1) The narratives of conflict between Buddhists and Bonpos during the imperial period

2) The narratives of conflict between Indian Mahāsiddhas with Hindus during the early new translation period

3) The narratives of conflict expressed in the subjugation of Rudra, the Ogre King of Lanka, in Nyingma Mahāyoga sources (which clearly parallel Rama's defeat of Ravana in the Ramayāna) and those expressed in the subjugation of Bhairava/Shiva, etc. in the Sarma tantras.

4) The narratives of conflict of Indian Buddhists with masters of the Atiyoga lineage.

Please do not forget that Indian Buddhists completely rejected Ati as a heresy, completely. People forget this. One could make the argument that treasures attributed to Padmasambhava such as klong gsal nyi ma bar ma rgyud, mkha' gro snying thig and so on served to validate and normalize the heretofore controversial teachings of Dzogchen that were under severe attack by Kadampas, Sakyas, and so on and earlier, during the tenth century by such people as Lha Bla ma Yes she 'od, etc i.e. the tenth century Buddhist conservatives who maintained the old imperial era policies against translating mahayoga tantra texts and so on. Creating the narrative that Padmasambhava had validated them served to propel Nyingthig to new heights of popularity. Not only were there treasures, but also in the kama tradition we find texts with colophons stating they were translated by Guru Padmasambhava. The problem here is that the first Nyingma catalogue of Tantras was not compiled until the 13th century, etc., etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: Triyik Yeshe Lama.

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

1. The Bonpo Dzogchen Guardians have ordered the Masters to teach it openly
2. Dzogchen Teachings are an open secret i.e. if one has no capacity then one will not be able to understand them and will not be interested in reading
3. For those who have the capacity and connection, it may bring great benefit by providing a link to the text and Master which they can then follow if they wish to enter the way of dzogchen
4. It is clearly stated in the text that if one wishes to put these Teachings into practice then just reading the book is not enough. One must find and follow an authentic Master.

So reading is different than doing the practice. i guess it is always good to have some knowledge before one gets started.

Malcolm wrote:

I was not talking about other people, I was referring to how those who consider themselves students of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu ought to behave.

I, for one:

a) have no problem with all Dzogchen teachings be taught openly.

b) do not consider Dzogchen secret in anyway. "Secret" does not mean "...never show anyone" -- it means, only show it to those who are interested. Do not talk about thogal, etc., on internet forums, bars and coffee shops. For example, Tibetans call one's private parts "gsang gnas", the secret place. So, just like we do not expose our penises and vaginas in public places, and only show them to people who are interested, likewise, these teachings should only be shown to people who are interested. They should not be made available so people can make a kind of book collection.

c) people who want to read Heartdrops can buy the book. I do not support this idea that all books should be downloadable for free.

4) Yes, I know. It says this clearly.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But we should not kid ourselves into to believing that liberation is only possible according to our preconceptions.

Pero said:

What does it matter if we "kid ourselves" like that?

Malcolm wrote:

Then we enter into unnecessary limitations.

By the way, I did not assert to TKfan that there was liberation in other schools.

Merely that his dogmatic scholastics were articles of faith, not proofs of anything concrete.

When you asked me if I think liberation is possible outside of Buddhism, the only answer is yes, because otherwise, we would not have Buddha, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

In the end we have little time and no doubt Buddhadharma leads to Buddhahood. You cannot say the same about other teachings (save Bon).

Malcolm wrote:

I am not suggesting we change anything. I am in the path I am content with. But we should not kid ourselves into believing that liberation is only possible according to our preconceptions.

The best thing is to just confess that one does not know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

But the thing is there is no knowledge of the reality of phenomena outside of Buddhism and Bon (and Dzogchen).

Malcolm wrote:

Are you really, really, really sure about that? And what would it cost you if you were wrong about that?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Pero said:

Malcolm, do you now believe that achieving Buddhahood is possible outside of Buddhism and Bon (including Dzogchen)?

Malcolm wrote:

Achieving Buddhahood has always been possible outside of "Buddhism". There was no Buddhism when appeared. or when Tonpa Shenrab appeared. Or when Ngon Dzog Gyalpo, appeared. Etc. In fact, Ngondzog Gyalpo left no Buddhist sangha behind. Nor when Zhonnu Pawo Tobden appeared, or Nangwa Dampa, etc.

Then there are pratyekabuddhas. They in fact often appear in the garb of so called non-Buddhist ascetics.

Nagarjuna has said that even if there are no Buddhas in the world, it is always possible to for there to be liberation anyway since the reality of phenomena is always present.

So yes I think it is possible. I do not think any longer that liberation is the sole province of Buddhists.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 19th, 2012 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Your story is right except that Gyerpung Nang Zher Lodpo was a student from Taphiritsa.

Malcolm wrote:

Vision/student, same difference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since there is no arising, there is no cessation,
no coming nor going, all pervasive;
the unmoving supreme dharma of great bliss,
immaculate liberation equal with space.

Without a foundation, unsupported,
non-abiding, not appropriated, a great dharma;
a vast naturally uniform primordial liberation
not bound nor unbound.

An all-embracing dwelling place that has always existed,
thoroughly uncorrupted, beyond karma,
a vast area, the expanse of space,
the blazing great dharma is the orb of the sun and the moon.

Naturally formed and personally experienced,
a vajra, a mountain, a great lotus,

the sun, a lion, wisdom, a song,
Great sound, incomparable music.

Enjoyed to the limits of space,
fully awakened equal with all the buddhas,
on the vast stage of Samantabhadra, the pinnacle of dharma,
in the dimension of space, the spacious womb of Samantabhadri,
the naturally-formed luminous dimension has always been totally perfect.

This is my rendering in a more literal way done some years ago, and slightly revised this morning.

There is a very beautiful free rendering of the Song of the Vajra on page 91 of Crystal and the Way of Light. It seems to have been taken from an oral commentary, so not all the words of the Tibetan text of Longchenpa's translation [found in the Tshig don mdzod, vol. 2, page 1295] are represented in this version.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to Tun huang documents, Gyer chen sNang bzhed lhod po was a contemporary of Srongtsan Gompo. He wrote down the rgyud chung bcu gnyis, the root verses of the whole Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud after a vision of Taphihritsa, and wrote a number of commentaries on them.

Jnana said:

Okay. Are there Dunhuang documents containing Bon teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

However, it is clear that Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud predates the arrival of Dzogchen from India.

Jnana said:

Clear from archaeological sources? Or text-critical analysis? Or?...

Malcolm wrote:

As to one, yes. As to two, in terms of archaeology, not yet so far as I know. In terms of text criticism, ChNN has done a lot of work here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Unknown said:

Personally, I have no confidence that an awakened teacher has ever existed or will ever exist without realizing pratīyasamutpāda in both forward and reverse sequence and the four noble truths.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok.

And yet, the Bonpos had Dzogchen in the form of the Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud prior to the introduction of Shakyamuni's teachings into Tibet. This is a most excellent reason to support the notion that Dzogchen can be fruitfully practiced as an independent vehicle. What is your "objective fact to which all will readily agree, like the heat of a flame" that proves this claim that Bonpos had dzogchen prior to Buddhism being introduced into Tibet?

According to Tun huang documents, Gyer chen sNang bzhed lhod po was a contemporary of Srongtsan Gompo. He wrote down the rgyud chung bcu gnyis, the root verses of the whole Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud after a vision of Taphihritsa, and wrote a number of commentaries on them.

But you have not proven that awakened beings are found solely within Buddhism. Nor have you proven Buddhism alone has the methods of producing such beings. You have merely recited some received dogma. The fact that awakened beings are also found in Bon contradicts your assertion.

And what is your "objective fact to which all will readily agree, like the heat of a flame" for this claim that awakened beings are also found in Bon, specifically, prior to Buddhism being introduced into Tibet?[/quote]

That was not the scope of the question I had in mind Shardza, etc. However, it is clear that Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud predates the arrival of Dzogchen from India.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

If you meant I should be a dzogchen practitioner - I am practicing in Nyingmapa the Kün-zang Gongdü Nyinthig cycle of Pema Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, and that's fantastic. You can be a buddhist and a Dzogchen practitioner -- never said you couldn't.

M

Mariusz said:

As you will see I questioned you earlier and waiting for answers? You seems to me not reliable for such an advise now. Take your statement made outside Dharmawheel for example.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not see your question. This thread has 28 pages in three days -- a little hard to keep up.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Except if your "real state" actually holds a view. That then will be dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

But your primordial state does not contain a view.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 7:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

If you meant I should be a dzogchen practitioner - I'am practicing in Nyingmapa the Kün-zang Gongdü Nyinthig cycle of Pema Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, and that's fantastic. You can be a buddhist and a Dzogchen practitioner -- never said you couldn't.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 6:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

A deliciously funny thing about this thread is that those who are now opposing Malcolm most vehemently are relying to a great extent on the arguments he himself used years ago - and has abandoned by now and exposed as wanting. 27 pages of Malcolm being attacked by people who do little but raise Malcolm's ghosts - which he's all laid to rest

Andrew108 said:

Perhaps we shouldn't 'oppose' (and 'we' don't actually) but just accept. Sounds like you might have the mindset to be a good Dzogchen practitioner. Just wait until Malcolm speaks, accept what he says. No need to bother trying to work it out for yourself. Nice and easy way to enslave yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a very nice thing to say to THO. That is not respecting him at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 6:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Not to you, Malcolm, but to a lot of us it is.

M

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and that is fine. I have nothing against buddhists. I am nominally a buddhist. And I have nothing but love for Buddha's Dharma.

But many of our Dharma brothers and sisters, some my closest friends in Dzogchen Community, do not feel nor consider themselves buddhists. So I see no reason to condition them into accepting a label that is not important for them; just as I have no wish for you or anyone else to abandon a label that is important for you.

For example, if you came to me and said "I feel anyone can practice Mahāmudra". They do not need to be a Buddhist to do so." I would agree. End of conversation. If you said "I don't feel like a buddhist, but I really like practicing mahāmudra, I would said -- excellent.

For me it is not about accepting and rejecting the appellation "buddhist".

In the end, when it comes to the personal experience of your primordial state, that experience has never come with the lable "buddhist" attached to it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 6:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

tomamundsen said:

So, is the emphasis here on "considers themselves" as a Buddhist? Or do you mean they can actually hold views that are not in accord with Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

What kinds of views you hold does not really matter. Dzogchen is not a question of holding a view. It is a question of discovering your real state through your personal experience. All the intellectualization about what is Dzogchen? what is not Dzogchen? is it Buddhist? is it not Buddhist? will never, ever substitute for that personal experience. When you have that personal experience, all that intellectualization becomes unnecessary.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:01 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha just means someone who is awake. Also Hindu yogis and ascetics strive to become awake, to become Jivanmuktis, "liberated while still alive". What is your objective fact to which all will readily agree, like the heat of a flame, that these persons do not achieve awakening?

M

xabir said:

Have you seen a Hindu have experiential realization of the two emptiness, dependent origination, etc? I haven't. If they had, I can't see how they could still call themselves Hindu.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not answer the question I posts to T-fan.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 10:40 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Everyone has compassion because they have Buddhanature, but the wisdom methods to develop this Buddhanature and transform it into enlightenment can only be found within Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

What is your objective fact that proves this point? A fact so objective all will agree to it, just as all agree there is a sun in the center of our solar system?

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's also arguable that the methods to transform ordinary, limited compassion into enlightened compassion can also only be found within Buddha's teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

It is also arguable that this is not so. Hence, Hindus and those of other faiths very much disagree with you. What is your objective fact to which all will readily agree, just as all agree that the moon appears in the sky, that proves this to be so?

Tsongkhapafan said:

True compassion is really bodhichitta, and that, being a compassionate wish to become a Buddha, is most definitely and exclusively Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha just means someone who is awake. Also Hindu yogis and ascetics strive to become awake, to become Jivanmuktis, "liberated while still alive". What is your objective fact to which all will readily agree, like the heat of a flame, that these persons do not achieve awakening?

Tsongkhapafan said:

I'm not being sectarian and exclusivist

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you are. And that is perfectly alright. Just admit to yourself that you are being both sectarian and exclusivist. Self-knowledge is a very good thing.

Tsongkhapafan said:

everyone needs enlightenment, but in order to attain enlightenment it's very necessary to go for refuge to enlightened beings, their Teachings and their qualified followers to create the foundation, otherwise it's like trying to grow a seed with no soil.

Malcolm wrote:

But you have not proven that awakened beings are found solely within Buddhism. Nor have you proven Buddhism alone has the methods of producing such beings. You have merely recited some received dogma. The fact that awakened beings are also found in Bon contradicts your assertion. If they can be found in Bon, why can't they be found in

other traditions? Of course we can invent fantasies about why it is impossible for them to be found in other Dharmas. But those fantasies will be just fantasies. They will not be based in facts.

You are a Gelugpa. You pride yourself on hard logic and facts. Where do your facts end and unprovable beliefs begin? This is something for you to discover. When you discover where your facts end and where your beliefs begin, you will be just a little bit closer to the truth. When you discover where your facts end and where your beliefs begin, then you will be more free.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 10:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

...

Malcolm wrote:

You have to turn your email on to receive replies.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 7:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

"Buddhist" is not only lable, but the context and environment until complete realization of Dzogchen. I wish you to solve all your contradictions related with Buddhism. I remember your final statement after our long debate: intention of madhyamaka and dzogchen is the same. We are still in the progress. Thank you for inspirations

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Mariusz:

As I said, if it is important for you to contextualize Dzogchen as a buddhist path, that's ok with me. But I don't feel that need anymore. I don't find it necessary. I once felt very much as you did. But for a long while that feeling has been weakening. You can ask anyone from my e-Sangha days. I would be fiercely extolling the necessity of being a Buddhist to practice Dzogchen.

Buddhism does not own Dzogchen. No one does.

As I have said, I don't think one has to be a "Buddhist" (or a Bonpo) to practice Dzogchen. Dzogchen, from my point of view is an independent path for total realization. It does not depend on any other path. I am glad there are other paths. I am glad there is a Dharma out there for every person on the planet to follow. I am glad there is Bon Dharma, Hindu Dharma, Christian Dharma, Muslim Dharma, Jewish Dharma, Taoist Dharma, etc.

In Tibetan, the term Dharma is translated as Chos. What does chos means in Tibetan? It is the imperative of the term རྒྱལ་མཁོ་ ('chos) -- it means to set right, to fix, etc. The purpose of Dharma is to set right. So there are all kinds Chos out there for all kinds of people.

Not only are the intention of Madhyamaka and Dzogchen the same, the intention of all spiritual traditions is the same, the peace and ease that comes from freedom. That is what comes from setting things right.

So Dzogchen can be followed by Buddhists, Bonpos, Hindus, Jews, Christians right along side of their own religions. It is up to each person to decide this for themselves.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: mind/matter dichotomy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As we know, Madhyamaka adopts the conventional truth either according to the Sautrantika system, or the Yogacara system. But since it's own perspective is grounded in the Prajñāpāramitasūtras, it regards distinctions such as mind and matter to be merely conventional designations that do have any real basis apart from imputation.

Jnana said:

Don't you mean to say " merely conventional designations that do not have any real basis apart from imputation "?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

It means that when you have reached a decisive understanding in Madhyamaka then you will have a profound understanding of the Dzogchen view. So what could be better than that?

Malcolm wrote:

It means you will have understood the ka dag side. From personal experience I can tell you that the lhun grub side cannot be understood through intellectual analysis at all. It is completely missing in sutra altogether.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: protection from lower realms

Content:

Namdrol said:

The method of Dzogchen to protect practitioners from the three lower realms has not one single thing to do with tantric methods, Buddhist or Bon.

dakini_boi said:

Are you referring to the purification of the six lokas? If so, how can what you said be so, when the practice includes visualization & generation of deity?

Dronma said:

All practices of the Purification of Six Lokas from the Longsal Cycle include: Refuge and Bodhichitta, Guru Yoga with Padmasambhava, 6 Syllables of Samantabhadra, Song of the Vajra, and Dedication of Merits.

Especially the one, which is preliminary of the Path of Ati, includes visualization of Vajrasattva for purification.

Malcolm wrote:

It is sufficient to do Ati Guru Yoga and then engage in purification of six lokas. One can recite SOV or not, depending on how you feel. Then dedicate.

One can also do the Long Longsal Ngondro as you mention above. It is a beautiful practice. There is also another six lokas purification which ChNN will teach this year which is based on physical postures and breathing called "self liberation of the six lokas". It is very interesting.

So there is, like with everything, an essential way, a medium way and a more elaborate way, depending on your time and how you feel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What could you possibly want to know?

M

Clarence said:

Honestly, it is none of my business. That said, your development on the forum is very interesting. I just wonder whether your insights are the result of any special "experiences" or something else.

Maybe you reached third vision and came to your new realization. Or maybe you just started to think differently about things because you got a pet plant. You also changed your avatar name. You are now Malcolm and not Namdrol anymore. I just find it fascinating, that's all. Especially since there is another western Lama who also started saying similar things like you do after he did his 3-year retreat and he reached a certain level.

Malcolm wrote:

I had been thinking of ditching the namdrol nym for sometime. It is not like no one knows who I am.

At this point in my life and practice I just feel differently about things than I did before. I am nearly 50 (in about a month actually). I have spent most of my adult life engaged in the pursuit of spiritual truths. I remember when I first met Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. I was so buzzed someone needed to put chains on my legs to keep me from floating off the ground. It changed my life. But I am a stubborn person, and I was also very conditioned by the Sakya school by the time I met him. So when I did my three year retreat, I combined Lamdre practice with tregchö according to ChNN's instructions. I was in a golden cage of my own making (some will say I still am) to a large extent. I became very expert in debating various tenet systems.

Then, 2003, I started to study the system of Tibetan medicine. This changed my understanding of Dzogchen considerably because now I had access to a different way of seeing the body and I began to see things in Dzogchen teachings that that years of studying static tenet systems had not prepared me for. When I looked at Dzogchen texts after that, they became alive for me in a different way, the very language of the Dzogchen tantras changed. I understood Tibetan language differently.

Also I started to study medicine because it is useful for helping everyone, whereas with Madhyamaka and even Buddhism, people have to sign on to a point of view. With medicine, no one has to sign onto any point of view -- they are sick, they go to a practitioner like me, and I help them get well based on their own experience. It is all driven by their own experience. Dzogchen is also like that, as I see it. The view of Dzogchen and the view of Tibetan Medicine are exactly the same.

They both propose two states, a unchanged state and a changed state. The former is healthy and balanced and the latter is unhealthy and out of balance. The cause of the unhealthy state is ignorance. The role of introduction and practice in Dzogchen and diagnosis and therapies Tibetan Medicine are to remove ignorance through knowledge

(rigpa) and restore balance through methods. The changed state has all the components of the unchanged state, but because the unchanged state is not correctly seen, imbalances enter the system, change occurs, and ill-health results. When the imbalances are addressed the changed state is correct and returned to the unchanged state. The result of both Dzogchen and Tibetan Medicine is the body of light.

Tibetan Medicine is connected with Dzogchen and it is also connected with the ancient Rishis of India, the Drang srong of Tibet, and the immortals of China.

Why is institutional Buddhism different? Institutional Buddhism is a bit like allopathic medicine -- if you have x disease, you get exactly the same treatment as everyone else with x disease. Maybe it will cure a disease, but just as likely, you will contract another illness from your treatment. But if you go to a skilled Tibetan doctor, everyone who has x disease will receive a completely different treatment. So Dzogchen is like that, at least the Dzogchen that I practice, as I understand it.

If you go to Sakya, you get one practice, Nyingma, another practice, etc. Of course this is fine and there is nothing wrong with it. But in my opinion the modern institutional approaches we find in Tibetan Buddhism are not truly healthy, just like the institutional approaches to medicine create as many illnesses as they treat. I think they reflect more about Tibetan feudal culture than they do about Dharma. There are eight great practice lineages in Tibet and a thousand minor ones. That is a more accurate way to define things -- those eight practice lineages are the real Dharma in Tibet. Not, Kagyu, Sakya, Nyingma, Gelug, Jonang, Bon, etc.

I don't care anymore where wisdom comes from-- wisdom about plants, yoga, channels, winds, bindus, nature of mind, elements, people, etc. I just don't care anymore where it comes from. Wisdom is wisdom. If other people want to be involved in counting the horns on rabbits with tenet system studies, that is fine, I also put in my time with it until I realized it was a total waste of energy and never got me one inch closer to recognizing my true nature. That kind of knowledge, as far as I am concerned is only useful for polemics. And polemics are useful for nothing but passing the time, verbal flatulence for the most part.

There are beautiful teachings in the Vedas, the Puranas, Mahāyāna, the Pali Canon, Bon, Taoism, Confucism, Tantras, both Buddhist and Hindu, and of course, for me most of all, in the Dzogchen tantras irrespective of whether they are from Oddiyāna or Zhang Zhung.

We live in a world contaminated with rage, hate, anger, division and so many of us sit around and pick lint out of our navels. And the reason we do this is because we take our pet philosophy, whether it is Buddhism, Dzogchen, etc., and rather than helping one another, we try to convert everyone to our point of view. Lord (take your pick, Allah, Buddha, Jesus, Krishna) knows that in the past I also have behaved in precisely the same way. For example, our friend Magnus told this poor guy "If you are a Zen practitioner you must be a Buddhist!". My reply to this, if he does not feel like a Buddhist, then for Buddha's sake don't insist to him he must feel that way.

To be perfectly frank I don't really feel very much like a Buddhist either. I do feel like a Dzogchen practitioner, because that is what I spend most of my time doing and have been doing so since 1992. But please don't tell me I don't love the Dharma as much as the next guy because I am not feeling very buddhist anymore. There is more to the Dharma than the name "buddhist". Our friend Jñāna pointed out that Buddhism is for whoever is interested. This is perfectly true, well, with one proviso. Dharma is for whoever is interested. Buddhism is only for "Buddhists" by definition.

Just because I am not feeling very buddhist does not mean I won't practice Shitro for my loved ones and friends when they die, that I won't practice Mandarava for longevity, that I won't do Ganapuja to Guru Rinpoche, etc. Guru Rinpoche never said, for example, I will only come to Buddhists on the tenth day of the lunar month when they invoke me. He said I will come before anyone in person on the tenth day of every month who invokes me. This is his samaya, to appear in person to anyone who calls on him with faith (good thing he is beyond limitations because that day is very full of appointments). Don't tell me I don't have confidence in Guru Rinpoche because I am not feeling very buddhist. Don't tell me that my bodhicitta, or my love and compassion is defective because I am not feeling very buddhist these days.

Just because I am not feeling very buddhist does not mean that I have lost the sense of refuge. My path is the path of Dzogchen. It is not other paths. So the path upon which I am going for refuge is the Dzogchen path. If you want to see it as a buddhist or a bon path, that is ok if it makes you feel more comfortable. It is not meaningful for me to see the path of Dzogchen as a buddhist or bonpo. I am going for refuge on the Dzogchen path. I am not conditioning others. I am talking about it means for me. So I am going for refuge on a Dzogchen path and I am not feeling particularly like I need that label "buddhist" anymore. I also don't need the label "Dzogchen practitioner". But my path is Dzogchen, so that is the most accurate label for me at present, though "malcolm" is a little better still.

When I was feeling very Buddhist I used to read the religious books of other schools, but not to enjoy them, only to reject them. What foolishness! The Upanishads are beautiful. There is a beautiful hymn to medicinal herbs in the Atharvaveda. There are beautiful praises the moon, the sun, the stars, the planets and so on in the Rk Veda. The Bhagavad Gita is renowned for its beauty. But buddhists tend to merely read them to reject them. We even have rules about how much time we should spend reading non-buddhist books. What nonsense! When we read a Bonpo mdo (sutra), we read it to compare it with some imagined Buddhist "original" because we buddhists can't get our heads out of our own asses long enough to see how foolish we look. Because of this bias, Bonpos don't even want to share the beauty of their tradition with buddhists, because face it buddhists -- we (to the extent I still feel buddhist) have been total assholes to the Bonpos for 1400 years, ever since Srongtsan Gampo assassinated the last king of Zhang Zhung in the 5th decade of the seventh century. The buddhists scattered them like ants during the time of Trisrong Detsen, fabricated stories about their beliefs that are still repeated to this day, forced them to ape buddhist morays and so on.

I read authors like Wendell Berry, who is a lovely man, a very important writer in the local farming movement in the US who writes lovely things like the following:

It would be foolish, probably, to suggest that God's pleasure in all things can be fully understood or appreciated by mere humans. The passage suggests, however, that our truest and profoundest religious experience may be the simple, unasking pleasure in the existence of other creatures that is possible to humans. It suggests that God's pleasure in all things must be respected by us in our use of things, and even in our displeasure in some things. It suggests too that we have an obligation to preserve God's pleasure in all things, and surely this means not only that we must not misuse or abuse anything, but also that there must be some things and some places that by common agreement we do not use at all, but leave wild.

Berry, Wendell (2010-04-23). What Matters?: Economics for a Renewed Commonwealth (pp. 98-99). Perseus Books Group. Kindle Edition.

The old grumpy buddhist in me would have bristled at such language. Now I just see the beauty that Mr. Berry is trying to convey. For example, before a series of intense thunder storms yesterday in western Ma, I went for a walk up the hill. My senses open, as I walk up the hill, my heart beating faster, the stream by the road full from the previous days runoff, birds singing in the woods by the road, and I know exactly what Wendell Berry is talking about. As Garab Dorje said, "The Color of Rtsal is green".

We may not see directly the wisdom display that underlies all of our karmic experience, but if we know it is there through our personal experience, we can still come to the appreciation of mystery of things as they are, we can come a little bit more into balance when we integrate with our natural surroundings, sitting with the experience of the five elements. The teachings of the Gongpa Zanghtal state that we can also use our aesthetic experiences of beauty to be in a state of instant presence.

The lable "buddhist" was just getting in my way. It's a label I don't need anymore. I guess it does not really apply except in the most superficial of ways i.e. I am a Sakya Acharya. I have received teachings from Nyingma and Kagyu teachers, and even Bon teachers. I hold the lineage of Abhidharma, among other things. I have a small amount of skill explaining Dharma tenets and texts. I still enjoy reading sutras, tantras, sastras, though I read them now quite differently than I once did. These things many people will think define me as a Buddhist. But for myself, I really don't feel very buddhist.

But I definitely feel like a Dzogchen practitioner. And that, my friends, is all I want and need for the moment.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: protection from lower realms

Content:

Namdrol said:

The method of Dzogchen to protect practitioners from the three lower realms has not one single thing to do with tantric methods, Buddhist or Bon.

dakini_boi said:

Are you referring to the purification of the six lokas? If so, how can what you said be so, when the practice includes visualization & generation of deity?

Malcolm wrote:

I was not referring to the rushen practice of purification of the six lokas. Six lokas practice definitely does not necessarily included generation of a deity, though I have seen systems where it does.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot of misunderstanding of things that I have said here. There are some people who think this is a debate. It is not, at least not for me (apart from some correction of facts). Some people are uncomfortable with what it is they imagine I am saying. Other people seem to understand what I am saying but disagree, as is their right. Other people seem to understand and agree with it whole-heartedly. To make clear the main points as I stated them:

- 1) Dzogchen is a teaching for all of humanity, not just Buddhists or Bonpos
- 2) Dzogchen is an independent path, not dependent on sutra or tantra
- 3) All methods from any tradition or yāna can be utilized by a Dzogchen practitioner according to their understanding and condition
- 4) As Dzogchen practitioners, we should be free from all limitations of religion, ideology, nation, race, class and tribe

Andrew108 said:

There is a debate here because not everyone accepts this description of Dzogchen. From my own side I see this description as a reification whether unintended or not. That is what has been discussed. I am aware of what ChNN says about this but the above description has no meaning for me. And so we discuss it. No worries. Except of course when it is said that not accepting the above description implies a lack of faith or understanding even. And so it gets discussed.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for some people:

- 1) Dzogchen is not a teaching for all humanity, it is only for Buddhists and Bonpos
- 2) Dzogchen is not an independent path, it is dependent on sutra and tantra
- 3) Dzogchen practitioners should confine themselves to methods found in Buddhism and/or Bon

I accept that many people feel this way. It is their right to understand Dzogchen however they do. I am not interfering with anyone at all. I am merely expressing my own perspective.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

Putting Dzogchen on a special throne and calling it the only pure and true Dharma is actually a way to limit Dzogchen practitioners, not liberating them.

Malcolm wrote:

Please cite the passage where I said this?

Otherwise, please retract your mischaracterization of my writings.

M

heart said:

I am not quoting you Namdrol I am expressing what I think you are saying. If you don't think Dzogchen is the only pure and true Dharma I apologize. I think personally that the Dzogchen methods just don't sum up Dzogchen, it goes way beyond that.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

Dzogchen itself is a personal experience introduced by one's Guru. That is about all I said on the subject.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: mind/matter dichotomy

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The contradiction between sutra and tantra on the one hand, and Dzogchen on the other,

concerning the difference/non-difference between mind and matter is not an important contradiction.

dakini_boi said:

This is an intriguing point that Malcolm has made a few times lately. I had never heard it put in quite that way. I'm wondering, Malcolm, if you could give a short explanation of the sutra, tantra and dzogchen view on mind/matter. I would have thought that even in sutra, and definitely in tantra, because the nature of both mind and matter is emptiness, there would be no such dichotomy.

Malcolm wrote:

If you elevate everything to the ultimate level, even "...matter is unconditioned without anything missing", as it says in the Yum Chenmo, the sutra of Perfect Wisdom in 100,000 lines.

But the Buddhist scholastics from Sarvastivada up to Dharmakirti have always maintained a hard division between mind and matter, between *nāma* on the one hand and *rūpa* on the other. For example, in the account of the twelve links in the Vibhanga, the Pali Abhidharma compendium, when discussing the twelve nidanas, it even leaves off the *rūpa* in the nidana of *nāmarūpa*, running ignorance, formations, consciousness, name, etc.

The Yogacara school attempts to supercede this dualism through asserting that everything is fundamentally a projection of the mind -- in fact the 15th century Lamdre Master Khyentse Wangchuk states, there is no dualism of mind and matter because everything is mind.

As we know, Madhyamaka adopts the conventional truth either according to the Sautrantika system, or the Yogacara system. But since its own perspective is grounded in the Prajñāpāramitāsūtras, it regards distinctions such as mind and matter to be merely conventional designations that do have any real basis apart from imputation.

But we can see that this division is well preserved in Buddhist tantric literature (as well as Hindu tantric literature) when we find for example that the mind is described as a rider of a horse, *vāyu*. This is because both forms of tantra, Buddhist as well as Hindu, are concerned with the mechanics of the body for understanding how to gain realization through our embodiment through the practice of various kinds of yoga.

Granted, this is sometimes found in Dzogchen literature as well. But when we examine that actual system of Dzogchen according to the ancient Dzogchen tantras, we find that in fact even consciousness itself is generated physiologically in the body by a *vāyu*. I have yet to find in an original Dzogchen tantra the common Buddhist term *kham drug*, *sadadhātu* i.e. earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness. I may yet find it, but at least the Valby KWIC tool does not in fact list it in the 83 or so important Dzogchen tantras that he converted into searchable text files. It also does not list every instance of *thod rgal* in the Dzogchen tantras as well so its look up routines are not completely infallible. But there are hundreds of references to the five elements ('byung

Inga, pañcabhutani).

I have been also examining the Mdzod phug lately, Bon "Abhidharma" and cosmology, is largely freed from the constraints of Buddhist conservatism, has very interesting things to say about the five elements and so on, and when is a text clearly influenced by Dzogchen. A kind of Dzogchen Abhidharma. One of the reasons why I started looking into this text is that the Rigpa Rangshar tantra contains a very brief mention of a primordial egg cosmology which accounts for the formation of the world, similar to the Vedas and Bon:

Now, to demonstrate the ignorance of the object of delusion: delusion is deluded by the forgoing. The field is prior to the formation of the world; a so called "wish-fulfilling tree" grows, a tree growing from the blessing of the youthful vase body of the buddha, born from warmth and moisture which arose from an egg. The Sahāloka formed from the mind disturbing the so-called self-originated wisdom in that. That is called the ignorance of the field of delusion.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Clarence said:

Very interesting thread. Fascinating to follow Malcolm's development over the years.

Now, Malcolm-la, will you also start telling us about your practice? That would be really nice.

Malcolm wrote:

What could you possibly want to know?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 18th, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I totally agree, and it wasn't ChNNR that started this thread with a statement that Dzogchen contradict sutra and tantra.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps you should go back and read the post that started this thread.

heart said:

Oh I did several times Namdrol. You don't come straight out and say it but it is there.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so it is true that you are reacting to your own projections.

heart said:

Putting Dzogchen on a special throne and calling it the only pure and true Dharma is actually a way to limit Dzogchen practitioners, not liberating them.

Malcolm wrote:

Please cite the passage where I said this?

Otherwise, please retract your mischaracterization of my writings.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I know what a contradiction is and as you can see below Namdrol think there is one, not me.

Malcolm wrote:

There are all kinds of contradictions between various yānas. For example:

In Hināyāna a monk may eat meat but must not touch gold.

In Mahāyāna a monk must not eat meat but may touch gold.

In Vajrayāna a monk may both eat meat and touch gold.

The contradiction between sutra and tantra on the one hand, and Dzogchen on the other, concerning the difference/non-difference between mind and matter is not an important contradiction.

A more important contradiction between sutra, tantra and Dzogchen is that the latter is a vehicle beyond cause and result, whereas both sutra and tantra are vehicles of cause and result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot of misunderstanding of things that I have said here. There are some people who think this is a debate. It is not, at least not for me (apart from some correction of facts). Some people are uncomfortable with what it is they imagine I am saying. Other people seem to understand what I am saying but disagree, as is their right. Other people seem to understand and agree with it whole-heartedly. To make clear the main points as I stated them:

- 1) Dzogchen is a teaching for all of humanity, not just Buddhists or Bonpos
- 2) Dzogchen is an independent path, not dependent on sutra or tantra
- 3) All methods from any tradition or yāna can be utilized by a Dzogchen practitioner according to their understanding and condition
- 4) As Dzogchen practitioners, we should be free from all limitations of religion, ideology, nation, race, class and tribe

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

"Dzogchen is a path. You can start with Dzogchen, you can finish with Dzogchen."

-- ChNN 5/17/12

Jnana said:

Yes, and there's really nothing provocative or controversial in this statement. Norbu Rinpoche is doing excellent work separating the wheat from the chaff.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as there is nothing really provocative or controversial in mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

if your Master is inside a Dzogchen Lineage ?

Namdrol said:

???

kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek,

Does it mean you don't know?

Mutstog Marro
KY

Malcolm wrote:
Who is my Guru, KY?

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 8:00 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
heart said:
To me it seems like a strange intellectual game trying to separate Dzogchen from the Buddha's Dharma.
/magnus

Namdrol said:
Well, it would be strange if that is what I was suggesting. But it appears that most people have not understood what I am talking about.

N

Andrew108 said:
In the end you are saying that..in order to be liberated that you only need study Dzogchen...Dzogchen for you is all inclusive...

Malcolm wrote:
Yes. That is what I am saying. The rest of what you have supposed does not apply.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:58 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
"Dzogchen is a path. You can start with Dzogchen, you can finish with Dzogchen."

-- ChNN 5/17/12

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

if your Master is inside a Dzogchen Lineage ?

Malcolm wrote:

???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:19 PM

Title: Re: neck trauma

Content:

Lobsang P. said:

I have had an MRI. The neck vertebrae are intact but muscularly compromised.

I have a vague memory of reading that chronic inflammation can be aided by diet.

Malcolm wrote:

fresh beef, goat, goat milk, etc. I will get back to you more recommendations

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:10 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

I totally agree, and it wasn't ChNNR that started this thread with a statement that Dzogchen contradict sutra and tantra.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps you should go back and read the post that started this thread:

This is a very good question. I have been moving slowly toward the pov of view that for most people studying these lower yānas is a complete waste of time. Oh, it can be useful to study a bit of Abhidharma because it helps contextualize mandala practice, and Madhyamaka does help cut through intellectual proliferation, properly studied and absorbed. Studying a bit of Madhyamaka helps one avoid the pitfall of crypto-advaita.

Also places where Dzogchen differs from sutra and tantra will not be readily understood if one does not have at least some superficial familiarity with them.

You don't really need to study all this sutra stuff to understand Dzogchen, and as far as Tantra goes, anuyoga is sufficient. On the other hand, also a practitioner needs to understand that nothing really limits their practice to so called "Dzogchen practice" -- anything at all whether from Buddhist or non-Buddhist sources like Yoga, etc., can be incorporated into Dzogchen practitioner's life. One can even participate in a non-Buddhist religion, if for some reason that is necessary.

I personally think one will understand Dzogchen much better if one is grounded in sutra and tantra, but no, it is not completely necessary to learn these things. Understanding the five elements, three gates, emptiness, and bodhicitta are about all one needs at bare minimum. That, and a realized Guru -- and those are in rather short supply.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

To me it seems like a strange intellectual game trying to separate Dzogchen from the Buddha's Dharma.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it would be strange if that is what I was suggesting. But it appears that most people have not understood what I am talking about.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 10:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

I agree that the two stages are not necessary in Dzogchen practice, but Anuyoga does not contain the two stages.

Namdrol said:

Both Mahāyoga and Anuyoga contain the two stages my dear. Please see section 2.8.5 in Precious Vase.

Thanks.

N

Dronma said:

I am trying to find what you are saying in the Precious Vase.

I don't see anything in any of the existing 2.8.5 sections.]

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what edition you are using. I am using the 1999/2000 edition, the outline numbers off by one in the revised translation. The section is titled "the fundamental difference between mahāyoga and anuyoga".

In any event, both Mahāyoga and Anuyoga have the two stages. The difference in the creation stage and completion stage i.e. gradual or non-gradual, marks the difference between Mahāyoga and Anuyoga in terms of method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

It is impossible for a Nirmanakaya emanation Shakyamuni to have a Nirmanakaya emanation Garab Dorje.

Malcolm wrote:

ok if you say so

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

The gist of what is being said here, is that Dzogchen...

Malcolm wrote:

...can be practiced by anyone who is interested to do so regardless of their institutional affiliation to any of the world's religions, regardless of their culture, etc.

But since no one listens to this when my guru, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu says this, it is not surprising then that no one listens to me when I say it.

C'est la vie.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

The unpleasant tangle starts when we try to establish through our personal experience a universal rule which is good to be followed by everybody.

[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

The unpleasant tangle starts when people start engaging in unfounded projections that are based ultimately in their own attachments and fears rather than carefully listening and reading and paying attention.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I am still not clear on when Shakyamuni Buddha taught Dzogchen?

Namdrol said:

Never, but he predicted Garab Dorje.

N

LunaRoja said:

When exactly did he predict him and what did he say?

Malcolm wrote:

You are already asked me this and I told that apart from ChNN's say so, I dont have a handy citation. When I have it, I will present it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:37 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Dronma said:
I agree that the two stages are not necessary in Dzogchen practice, but Anuyoga does not contain the two stages.

Malcolm wrote:
Both Mahāyoga and Anuyoga contain the two stages my dear. Please see section 2.8.5 in Precious Vase.

Thanks.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 7:24 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

LunaRoja said:
I am still not clear on when Shakyamuni Buddha taught Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:
Never, but he predicted Garab Dorje.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 6:53 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Norwegian said:
If you think that Dzogchen does not have an ethical framework, or think that Dzogchen do not have methods that guards practitioners from the lower realms (and so on), then you really don't know anything at all about Dzogchen.

gregkavarnos said:
Of course it currently has ethical frameworks: Buddhist and Bonpo. Of course it has methods to guard practitioners from the lower realms: Buddhist tantric methods.

Malcolm wrote:

The method of Dzogchen to protect practitioners from the three lower realms has not one single thing to do with tantric methods, Buddhist or Bon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think that the failure of the Dzogchen that is being presented here...

Malcolm wrote:

That is the failure of the Dzogchen you are presenting. Not the failure of Dzogchen as I have come to understand it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: My Open Message to Gyatrul Rinpoche

Content:

mujushinkyo said:

Hey, thanks Andrew and also to all of you. I must say I am only asking for help because it's starting to get worse again, rather than better. I thought that when the FBI returned my laptops I wouldn't hear anything from "Jetsunma" again. But last week she threatened to sue me over my Twitter posts. Also, the crazy "Protecting Nyingma" blog is now claiming that I'm conspiring with William Cassidy to fly helicopters over the KPC compound (!!).

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I saw that. What a bunch of kooks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nothing the Buddha taught was false, first of all. Everyone should understand that at the outset ... But Dzogchen as such as self-sufficient. The Dzogchen tantras themselves describe a complete teaching that is not dependent on any other teaching, but which can be integrated with anything a practitioner needs.

gregkavarnos said:

Wouldn't you say though that Buddh-ism does play an important role by providing the framework within which Buddhadharma can be practiced AND protected? I mean if it wasn't for Buddh-ism then people like Michael Roach, Aro, Jax, neo-Advaita and some new age shamanic Dzogchenpas would have free reign with no structure or framework to compare them to, and thus define them, as adharmic. The Four Dharma Seals are Buddhadharma AND the defining characteristic of Buddh-ism as well. I don't know if one can separate them at this point in history without pulling the finger from the dyke and causing a deluge.

Malcolm wrote:

I think we need to make a distinction between the worldly institutions we called "Buddhism" and the Dharma it is supposed to represent. Words like Buddhist, Buddhism, etc. are not important.

The Dharma is important. In particular, Dzogchen is a complete teaching unto itself. It also encompasses all Dharmas whether nominally Buddhist or not. -- but I have explained this already.

Dronma said:

What makes you believe that Dzogchen (even in the case of being totally disengaged from any Buddhist preconceptions) will not follow the same deterioration?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is is not a school, it is not a sect, it is not a philosophy, it is not a religion -- it is a personal experience. It has a view, a meditation, conduct and a result grounded in that personal experience. Since it is based on a personal experience (introduced by a master who is capable of introducing that knowledge to us) Dzogchen is immune to degeneration of that kind. Of course, we must find a master who has that capacity.

Now then, if it makes you happy to consider me a Buddhist, I am fine with that. I have nominally been a Buddhist since I was too ignorant to understand that that meant 16 or so. I also have those Dharma lineages which I treasure since all Dharma is important as it was taught to benefit people. But I once received Guru Yoga transmission from Tenzin Wangyal many years ago, so some people might consider me a Bonpo too. I very much would like to receive the transmission of Zhang Zhung Nyan rGyud from Loppon Tenzin Namdak -- and if I can do that, some Buddhists will consider me a tainted Bonpo, just as people have complained for years about Chogyal Namkhai Norbu -- accusing him of being a Bonpo. For several years, I have wanted to study Hatha Yoga and the Yoga Sutras with a qualified brahmin master I know about, a disciple of Krishnamacarya -- I have not been able to make time to do that -- but if I do, some of you will feel certain that I have broken my vows of refuge by studying with this brahmin master, learning how to chant the Yoga Sutras in proper Sanskrit cadences and so on.

Dronma, do you have any idea how many people in the Dzogchen Community do not

consider themselves Buddhists at all in any sense? They simply do not self-identify as buddhists. I used to be annoyed by this, but now I deeply understand where they are coming from. Refusing to consider yourself a buddhist is not a denegration of Buddhadharma, and does not disqualify one from studying and practicing Buddhadharma. Refuge, as we know, is merely being interested in following a path and doing so. In this thread I noticed so far that some people are very attached to the name "Buddhist", but this is just a label. Even Chogyal Namkhai Norbu has said that really, he is not a "Buddhist", that he is a Dzogchen practitioner. This used to bother me too and was an obstacle for many years. Not considering yourself a Buddhist is not disrespectful to Buddhadharma.

So what am I? like all of you, I am a human being, I use speech and I am able to make distinctions -- this is the basic definition of a human being according to Tibetan Medicine. Second, I am a man -- I have that gender mark. So this is the first place where we differentiate human beings. Third, I am middle aged. The next way we distinguish people is on the basis of their age. Fourth, I am an Anglophone (obviously). Fifth I am a caucasian. Sixth, I am Dzogchen practitioner. Seventh, I am a doctor of Tibetan Medicine. That's it. That is all I need to be and all I want to be. And I have no choices about the first five items.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: colored light

Content:

dakini_boi said:

So then, the appearance of the five lights are still a manifestation of ignorance?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but in this case it is non-afflictive ignorance, since the imputational ignorance is that which does not recognize this display to be its own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Hi Namdrol - so the purpose of Dzogchen is to have this buddhanature recognized and demonstrated? Isn't it the case that only the qualities can be recognized and demonstrated?

Malcolm wrote:
That is not the case.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:32 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:

Namdrol said:
One does not need to be grounded in and conditioned by "conventional" Dharma in order for Dzogchen to be introduced to a student who is interested.

justsit said:
Does it matter if the student is not only interested but ready, or "ripened," as it were?

Malcolm wrote:
Interest indicates ripeness for the teachings.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 2:21 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Dronma said:
Do you dissociate Dharma from Buddhism? [/color]

Namdrol said:
It is obvious that Buddhism is rife with Adharma these days, so yes, yes I do.

gregkavarnos said:
So separate it from Buddh-ism yet maintain its basis in Buddhadharma? Is that what you are saying?

Malcolm wrote:
Nothing the Buddha taught was false, first of all. Everyone should understand that at the outset.

What the Buddha taught is Dharma, there is no doubt. But the Buddhist schools that have sprung up around the teaching of the Buddha are mired in various limitations, no doubt all with the best of intentions. We can know this because the Dzogchen tantras describe in very clear detail what the limitations of each of the nine yānas, as well the samsaric vehicles, are, as well as the polemical schools in classic Indian Buddhism, the four siddhāntas i.e. vaibhāṣika, sautrāntika, yogācāra and mādhyamika.

For example, our friend Andrew 108 is very enamored of the idea of the three Dharmacakras, and advocates the standard gzhan stong approach to Vajrayāna that sees the three turnings as being a progressive series of teachings intended to prepare

one for Vajrayāna, with gzhan stong being the ultimate view which is carried through sutrayāna. This is certainly one approach to Dzogchen teachings, and perhaps it works for some people. It doesn't work for me because even though these sutras are profound and interesting, in terms of personal experience intellectual views do not matter much.

I personally ceased being very interested in the intellectual study of tenet systems many years ago when I understood from a work by Gorampa Sonam Senge's that they are unnecessary for Vajrayāna practitioners in general. Since that time I have been primarily interested in the Yogic side of Buddhism once I understood finally that correct view is based on the personal experience of the introduction and not on any intellectual analysis and subsequent meditation. Of course, if you are not a Vajrayāna practitioner, then this intellectual analysis and subsequent meditation is the only method of progress. It can be effective in the very long run, but it requires many lifetimes of effort and application. There is no short path sans secret mantra.

There are others such as Magnus, who may agree with the above, but still believe that it is essential to engage in practices of the two stages and so on and so forth as a preparation for Dzogchen practice and realization.

But there are other practices in Dzogchen for supporting and reinforcing the experience of introduction so it is not certain that the two stages are necessary in Dzogchen practice at all, though it can be helpful for some. Also since the teaching of the basis in Anuyoga and Atiyoga is the same, for this reason Anuyoga practice is especially suited for Dzogchen practitioners who need or want to practice the two stages.

But beyond this, methods such as fire puja, sang offerings, lungta, namkha, lü, bla gug, etc., all these practices from the mundane vehicles can also be employed for the health and well being of the practitioner.

But Dzogchen as such is self-sufficient. The Dzogchen tantras themselves describe a complete teaching that is not dependent on any other teaching, but which can be integrated with anything a practitioner needs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Dronma said:

Do you dissociate Dharma from Buddhism? [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

It is obvious that Buddhism is rife with Adharma these days, so yes, yes I do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

You can see from this quote how closely a genuine understanding of rigpa is tied to the buddhist vehicles (second and third turnings) and it is presented as a union of these two. So the idea of Dzogchen standing by itself is wrong in my view because this would be like presenting just the 'union' without an understanding of the the things that were unified. In this case the second and third turnings. To proceed in this way distorts the teachings and you get left with just the skin of it and none of the meat so to speak. I don't really see Namdrol disagreeing with this but there has been a habit of experienced Dzogchen practitioners believing that Dzogchen is all you need. The process that gets you to to a point where Dzogchen is all you need has been forgotten about and there is a little bit of celebratory arrogance at work.

Malcolm wrote:

I completely disagree with this. I do not think a genuine understanding of rigpa is necessarily tied to the second and third turnings at all.

I might have agreed with this once, but my understanding has changed considerably.
N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 17th, 2012 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

We are debating whether or not this knowledge can be introduced in an authentic way without the student first being grounded in and conditioned by so-called 'conventional' dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

You're debating this. For me there is no debate. One does not need to be grounded in and conditoned by "conventional" Dharma in order for Dzogchen to be introduced to a student who is interested.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is making the claim that distinction between the sentient and the non-sentient is false. You can work out the rest.

N

Andrew108 said:

Sorry for being pedantic but the statement is not making a distinction as to what is false - otherwise that would be a position held in regard to the relative. And as you know in Dzogchen there are no positions held in terms of conventional and ultimate truth.

Malcolm wrote:

There are statements made with regard to what a product of ignorance and a product of knowledge.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

..I'm asking because one might say if buddhahood is an innate attribute then why also follow Dzogchen teachings or 'become a Dzogchenpa'? Here we just seem to be replacing Buddhism with Dzogchen. Within buddhism there are many sutras that talk explicitly about buddhanature for example.

Malcolm wrote:

As it says in the Tantra of Self-arisen Vidyā, that buddhahood exists to be demonstrated. If it is not demonstrated, it will not be recognised, thus the purpose of following Dzogchen teachings.

Tathagatagarbha as it is discussed in sutra is not discussed as something that can be demonstrated, rather it is quite the opposite. According to the Śrīmāladevisūtra, for example, Tathagatagarbha can only be seen by buddhas. It is not a buddhahood that exists to be demonstrated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Guru Chowang makes no mention of Padmasambhava at all in his Great History of Treasures.

[/i]

Mariusz said:

Heavy statement. Are you completely sure? I just quoted. Have you received the commentaries/oral instructions on it?

Malcolm wrote:

What I meant was, that when he discusses Bon in his "Great History of Treasures", which I cited above directly, he makes no mention of Padmasambhava.

We have not access to the terma, bka' rstis, that Padma Namgyal cites in his text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Namdrol - Dzogchen is your religion. Is this not the case? Could you give it up?

Namdrol said:

No, for me, Dzogchen is not a religion, nor it is a philosophy. I cannot speak about other people's perspective.

Mariusz said:

Can I ask you a personal question if you are not a buddhist now?

Malcolm wrote:

I never said I was not a Buddhist. You apparently did not pay very close attention to my post. But go ahead and ask anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Namdrol - Dzogchen is your religion. Is this not the case? Could you give it up?

Malcolm wrote:

No, for me, Dzogchen is not a religion, nor it is a philosophy. I cannot speak about other people's perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Jnana said:

Well, "Buddhism" is just a designation primarily referring to the theories and practices associated with the Buddha's Dharma, and other related social and cultural accretions.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma is a better descriptive than "Buddhism"; it excludes the related social and cultural accretions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

According to our karmic vision plants are non-sentient. But according to Padmasambhava in the Khandro Nyinthig:

After first being created by the energy (rtsal) of wisdom, in the middle, as it was not recognized that the body of the refined part of the assembled elements actually is the five wisdoms, since this was not realized through intellectual views, the non-sentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it... As such, the sign of non-duality is [the body] disappearing into wisdom without any effluents because the critical point of the non-duality or sameness of the non-sentient and the sentient was understood according to the Guru's intimate instructions.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Thanks a lot.

Andrew108 said:

This is part of the all inclusive view of Dzogchen where there really isn't 'reality' - just wisdom. So it's not saying plants are sentient and it's not saying that they are not. It's not making claims about sentience as such or that there is a reality that can be established as anything other than wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

It is making the claim that distinction between the sentient and the non-sentient is false. You can work out the rest.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:41 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

Personally as a vegan I know I am doing a very small favor to livestock animals by being on the vanguard of the animal liberation movement with my dietary choice, not to mention the health and environmental benefits. Every year over 10 billion totally enslaved animals are slaughtered so Americans can be one of the fattest populations around the globe.

tobes said:

How about this argument Thrasymachus: If no one ate meat, those 10 billion animals would not ever be born. If you care for their sentience, isn't it better that they exist rather than they never exist?

Five years in a paddock, as a sentient creature, is surely more valuable than non-existence.

The cause of those 5 years of sentient life? People eating meat!

You want an argument about causality, here it is. Advocating global veganism is not simply advocating the cessation of killing: it is also advocating the cessation of breeding, birth, life and the existence of however many animals are desired by humans for food.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he wants us all to keep them as pets. Oh right, I forgot, keeping pets is chattel slavery too. I guess we just cut all these cows, chickens and pigs loose and let them fend for themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Dzogchen is for anyone who is interested, without any preconditions at all.

Jnana said:

So is Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is not really true.

Dharma is for anyone who interested without preconditions. Buddhism is a religion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:36 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is the Shenrab Miwoche from Bon listed among the 12 Dzogchen Buddhas?

Namdrol said:

Not in the sgra thal gyur. But Tonpa Shenrab has been added to the 12 Teachers by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, where he has an equal position with the twelve mentioned in the sgra thal gyur

Mariusz said:

So what is the source or quote He did it?

Malcolm wrote:

I just cited one source, Guru Chowang. But in general, it is because ChNN considers Zhang Zhung Nyan rGyud a valid independent stream of Dzogchen he includes Tonpa Shenrab with the other twelve who existed before Garab Dorje.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Tashi delek. It is great the Bon in Tibet entered Buddhism, including Dzogchen, not only from Gelug. Buddhism is without bias. Just quoting "the Practice of dzogchen" p.109: In terma discovered by Guru Chowang: when Guru Padmasambhava was in absorption..Tibet controlled by Bon, was hard to spread Dharma ...he manifested as Shenhla Odkar. Terton Longsal Nyingpo said: Guru Padmasambhava saw Zhangzhung would be only tamed by Bon. He went there with the retinues of self-lights and spoke "My father is Trenpa Yeshekyi Namkha... opened the door of numerous teachings....

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Chowang makes no mention of of Padmasambhava at all in his Great History of Treasures. He writes:

First: the two the supreme of all beneficial qualities, [5/a] the treasure of the true words of Bon emanations: the way the compassionate body came from the pure dimension of the bon nyid [= dharmatā] and the after the treasure of body, speech and mind arose,

the way the teaching was spread, i.e. the way a treasure descends from a treasure.

First: the pure dimension of the bon nyid, completely free from falling into any parts or divisions was singular and unique, the treasure of the hidden Bon dharmakāya [bon chos sku] which has nothing to give up, appeared from pure activity to tame beings as the sambhogakāya Shenlha Wodkar [gshen lha 'od dkar]. The way his compassion was moved is that in general he thought of all migrating beings. Specifically, he thought of beings in Jambudvīpa.

Second: after the treasure of the body, speech and mind was produced, the teachings were widely spread. The way the treasure descends from a treasure is that in order to tame the the confusion of ignorance, the root of samsara, at Wolmo Lungring in the land of Zhang Zhung the hidden treasure of compassion arrived in the form of Shenrab Miwoche [gshen rab mi bo che, i.e. the supreme one of the Shen clan, the greatest of men]. The hidden treasure was concealed in a single intention by all the Tathāgatas in the mind of Shenrab, and he taught the nine vehicles of Bon.

Afterwards, Shenrab's words were collected by the fortune Bonpos and placed in a catalogue. The cause Bon tamed ordinary beings, and result Bon tamed intelligent beings.

The teachings were spread in Tokharistan, where people wear silk turbans, the land India and the border lands and also spread in dPur rGyal in Tibet and Bon was disseminated first.

The King was given the name as the Elder Brother of Bon because he made sure the teaching did not decline, and also he concealed the Bon treasures of cause and result in Zhang Zhung the temple of Shampo Lhatse. Furthermore, as they were spread in the mountain of white peaks in Oddiyana, the Chinese mountain Dru Dzin and in southern and northern Tibet, having concealed treasures which descended from treasures, the Bon texts were not destroyed, and the Bonpo's became renowned.

Also I, Chowang, say that the profound teaching of Bon is uninterrupted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:18 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Isn't it the case that you want to do the SMS course? Why do the course if it's o.k to have received the transmission and to be an outsider?

Malcolm wrote:

Look at your language of exclusion.

But to answer your question, why do not do the course?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:14 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

If Garab Dorje would be the "first" "human teacher" who did teach Dzogchen here on our planet called world, that is a very one sided vision, imo.

Namdrol said:

Right, I did not say that, so you were not reading carefully: Garab Dorje was the last, before him, Shakymuni, before him Shenrab, before him Kashyapa Buddha, before him, Ngondzong Gyalpo, etc.

Mariusz said:

Is the Shenrab Miwoche from Bon listed among the 12 Dzogchen Buddhas?

Malcolm wrote:

Not in the sgra thal gyur. But Tonpa Shenrab has been added to the 12 Teachers by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, where he has an equal position with the twelve mentioned in the sgra thal gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:57 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Shakyamuni is an emanation of Vajradhara, so is Garab Dorje. ChNN frequently calls Garab Dorje an emanation of Shakyamuni.

LunaRoja said:

My understanding is that ChNN said that Garab Dorje is an independent Nirmanakaya Manifestation. Where has he said that Garab Dorje is a Shakyamuni emanation? I would like to read this.

Thank you again for your help.

Malcolm wrote:

He said so yesterday in his lecture. You can listen in the replay.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:53 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

If Garab Dorje would be the "first" "human teacher" who did teach Dzogchen here on our planet called world, that is a very one sided vision, imo.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I did not say that, so you were not reading carefully: Garab Dorje was the last, before him, Shakymuni, before him Shenrab, before him Kashyapa Buddha, before him, Ngondzog Gyalpo, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 11:17 AM

Title: Re: colored light

Content:

dakini_boi said:

It is said that the nature of the five elements are the five colors of light. Is this actual visible light, or something else?

Malcolm wrote:

The colors which the five lights express arise because of the adulteration of the five wisdoms with karmic winds or vāyus, without which the five wisdoms have no manifest expression. At the gross level, these five lights are expressed though delusion as the five elements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 11:06 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

But this could get into a debate about whether or not non-Dzogchen traditions in themselves could introduce to people that which is introduced (the Nature of Mind) in Dzogchen (a debate which has been done to death).

anjali said:

I have no intention of stirring up any old debates, but, but an outsider looking in, it has been my experience that non-Dzogchen (specifically Advaita) traditions can introduce people to the cognizant nature of the mind. What seems to be missing is an

introduction to the essence of mind, emptiness. At least it was for me. Now back to your regularly scheduled program.

Dronma said:

In fact, Emptiness or Voidness or Sunyata does not exist to anyone of the aforementioned doctrines I am aware!

Which bring us the first and most serious obstacle for the actualization of the otherwise Namdrol's appealing theory.....

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is for anyone who is interested, without any preconditions at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Shakyamuni is an emanation of Vajradhara, so is Garab Dorje. ChNN frequently calls Garab Dorje an emanation of Shakyamuni.

LunaRoja said:

Yes, but when did Shakyamuni predict his emanation? This is definitely not in any sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have a specific citation for you. Perhaps the source is in the commentary to the sgra thal gyur. When I find it, I will post it. Though I may not do so anytime soon.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Also, it does not seem that Tonpa Shenrab taught all the Dzogchen tantras as Garab Dorje did. In fact Shakyamuni is considered to be a Teacher of Dzogchen, but he did not teach even one Dzogchen text. But he is so considered because he predicted his emanation of Garab Dorje.

N

LunaRoja said:

Garab Dorje is an emanation of Shakyamuni! I have never heard this before. When did he predict his emanation of Garab Dorje? Is this in the Dzogchen tantras?

LR

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni is an emanation of Vajradhara, so is Garab Dorje. ChNN frequently calls Garab Dorje an emanation of Shakyamuni.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I am confused about how our inherent state resting within it's primordial nature fulfills the bodhisattva vow.

Namdrol said:

When you realize your primordial state, out of that realization nirmanakāyas will naturally flow because compassion is inherent in your real nature.

tomamundsen said:

Could you elaborate on this, please?

Malcolm wrote:

One of the main functions of the third primordial wisdom of the basis, called thugs rje, and translated in various ways to emphasize different aspects, is to provide the basis for working for the benefit of sentient beings after samsara and nirvana "turn their backs on one another". When we consider this from the point of view of its function, we call it rtsal -- and this rtsal is what is visible to ordinary sentient beings -- everyone can experience rtsal directly through their six senses. In fact, the operation of rtsal through their six senses is what gives rise to sense consciousnesses and so on. Nirmanakāyas are simply the energy of the basis that functions to help sentient beings in samsara in the same way that a wishfulfilling gem grants all wishes, without thought, naturally, spontaneously.

So when we fully integrate with our primordial state and achieve the great transformation body or the body of light, out of that emanates so called nirmanakāyas to benefit sentient beings. Of course when we practice, we are practicing also out of concern for sentient beings. But we don't need to contrive that compassion. Even a hint of an experience of the nature of our mind is sufficient to activate our bodhicitta for others. This is a million times better than all the contrived meditations on bodhicitta one finds in such texts as Lam rim and so on. Of course, if you want to do Lamrim and

systematically cultivate bodhicitta, there is no fault.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Garab Dorje was the first human teacher of Dzogchen in this epoch.

dakini_boi said:

Thank you. Could you clarify what is the definition of "epoch"?

Malcolm wrote:

Good question. We can say during the śāsana of Sakyamuni Buddha. However, the cycles of manifestations of Dzogchen teachers do not really match up with the principles of so called supreme Nirmanakāyas.

Also, it does not seem that Tonpa Shenrab taught all the Dzogchen tantras as Garab Dorje did. In fact Shakyamuni is considered to be a Teacher of Dzogchen, but he did not teach even one Dzogchen text. But he is so considered because he predicted his emanation of Garab Dorje.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Plant a Bee Garden

Content:

Qian Zheng Yi said:

From The Honey Bee Conservancy:

<http://thehoneybeeconservancy.org/act-today-2/plant-a-bee-garden/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Fantastic Idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Zhang Zhung Nyengyud is an authentic line of Dzogchen intimate instruction that do not depend on Garab Dorje.

dakini_boi said:

I thought, according to ChNNR, Garab Dorje was the first teacher of Dzogchen on this planet (or in this time cycle or something, not sure of the terminology). . . am I mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje was the first human teacher of Dzogchen in this epoch. Tonpa Shenrab lived roughly 2000 years before the Buddha. Before him was Buddha Kashyapa, another Teacher in the 12 Traditions. In Dzogchen Community we add Tonpa Shenrab to the 12 teachers mentioned in the sgra thal gyur. And in the sras gicg bu rgyud many more teachers are mentioned beyond these twelve. So we can understand that in reality the Teachers of Dzogchen are limitless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I am confused about how our inherent state resting within it's primordial nature fulfills the bodhisattva vow.

Namdrol said:

When you realize your primordial state, out of that realization nirmanakāyas will naturally flow because compassion is inherent in your real nature.

LunaRoja said:

I thought the idea of the 3 KAYAS came from the Mahayana tradition. If Dzogchen posits Nirmankayas isn't this a Buddhist concept? How could a non-buddhist practice Dzogchen without an understanding of the 3 kayas?

Thank you for your help.

LR

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are just the essence, nature and energy/compassion of your own state. If you recognize that, it does not matter what you call them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Tibetan word for Buddhism denotes "to turn inwards". We must consider Buddhism as The science of mind.

Namdrol said:

Not exactly. The Tibetan word for "Buddhist" is "nang pa" "insider" as opposed to "phyi pa" i.e. outsider. We must cease to make a distinction between "insiders" and "outsiders".

Mariusz said:

I quoted His Eminence the Third Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche, Karma Lodrö Chökyi Senge; The Relationship between Buddhism & Christianity from http://www.dharmadownload.net/pages/english/Natsok/0010_Teaching_English/Teaching_English_0001.htm

Malcolm wrote:

Many forms of Hinduism would qualify as "Buddhism" under this definition of "nang pa" because certainly, Hindu yogins all turn "inwards" to observe their consciousness, just as Kongtrul says: "We look at the source of discontent by turning our attention on our consciousness." Under this definition Hindu religious tradition such as Yoga, Samkhya, Advaita, Trika, etc., as well as Bon, Sufism, Mystical Christianity, Taoism and neo-Confucism, and Modern Psychology in its various forms all qualify under the this definition.

But I will am happy to agree that by the definition you have provided all these different disciplines are devoted to turning "...our attention inwards".

However in reality, the term "nang pa" is a sectarian term which distinguishes insiders (Buddhists) from outsiders (Non-Buddhists, including Bonpos, depending on which Tibetan author one reads and depending on the century).

This we can see clearly in the common definition of nang pa in any Tibetan dictionary, but in particular, the bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo give it as follows:
nang pa: chos phyi nang gnyis su phyed ba'i nang pa ste sangs rgyas pa

Insider, the insiders of the division of both insider and outsider dharmas are the Buddhists (sang rgyas pa).

And for outsiders: phyi pa - phyi rol pa ste, sangs rgyas chos lugs pas rang nyid la nang pa zer zhing, rang gi chos lugs ma yin pa rnams la phyi rol pa'am mu stegs pa zer,

Outsider: the one who is outside. Dharma system of the Buddha calls itself "insiders", but those who are not of our dharma system are called outsiders or tīrthikas (mu stegs

pa).

If you gloss the term "nang pa" as Kongtrul has done (and this is a common gloss popular in the West), then as I said, you are left with the conclusion that all these tīrthikas are nang pas too. Which suits me just fine since they too are concerned to know their minds and turn inwards to do so.

So in the end we are left with the fact that this language should be abandoned. Buddhists should not call themselves "insiders" in contradistinction to "outsiders" as if Non-buddhists are not concerned with the same issues as freedom from suffering and liberation from the kleshas through turning their attention within for they very clearly are.

In fact the terms "insider" and "outsider" are just native sectarian Tibetan terms that Buddhists in Tibet used to distinguish themselves from Bonpos, Muslims, Christians, Taoists, and so on.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Mariusz said:

Tibetan word for Buddhism denotes "to turn inwards". We must consider Buddhism as The science of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. The Tibetan word for "Buddhist" is "nang pa" "insider" as opposed to "phyi pa" i.e. outsider. We must cease to make a distinction between "insiders" and "outsiders".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I am confused about how our inherent state resting within it's primordial nature fulfills the bodhisattva vow.

Malcolm wrote:

When you realize your primordial state, out of that realization nirmanakāyas will naturally flow because compassion is inherent in your real nature.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 3:01 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Andrew108 said:
So Namdrol have you realized your real condition?

Malcolm wrote:
That depends on what you mean by "realize".

if you mean experientially understand, than yes. If you mean am I prepared to go rainbow, not anytime soon, probably not in this lifetime unless I stop writing posts and translating texts, gardening, and everything else I do.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 2:35 AM
Title: Dzogchen and Compassion
Content:
Anders Honore said:
Are you saying bodhicitta is a dispensible part of Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:
Compassion is an innate quality of one's primdordial state i.e. the basis. You can't really give up bodhicitta, and you can't really create it. It can be covered over by obscurations, but those are adventitious. When you recognize your condition as it is, compassion for others naturally arises.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 16th, 2012 at 2:30 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Dzogchen is the heart of all paths, whether of samsara or nirvana, and is the truth that everyone is trying to discover. What is Dzogchen? We all know the answer to that question -- it is our real condition.

Everyone, no matter what religion they belong to, is trying to discover the truth. That truth exists in the heart of every single sentient being. So when you discover that truth, there is no need to remain locked in the limitations of "Buddhist" and "non-Buddhist".

Limitations are what cause all the suffering in the world.

We cannot change the world for others, but we can change the world for ourselves. The only way to do this is to evolve beyond the limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race, and tribe. If we go beyond these limitations through discovering our primordial potentiality, then we are participating in changing the world.

As we have seen, for example, the six liberations are not just for Buddhists -- you don't have to make someone a Buddhist in order to sing Song of the Vajra for them, for example, or recite the Aspiration of Samantabhadra -- any sentient being who hears these sung or recited will have a seed of future liberation planted in their continuum, thos grol (liberation through hearing). You don't have to make someone a Buddhist to give them some myong grol (liberation through taste), or give them a btags grol (liberation through wearing), or show them some image that is a mthong grol (liberation through sight), or give them some incense which is a specially formulated dri grol (liberation through smell), etc.

Of course I am a Buddhist. But where I used to be a Buddhist before I was a Dzogchen practitioner, now it is other way around. This is not because of some intellectual trip. This is based on my practice of Buddhism and Dzogchen for 20+ years now.

I can see really clearly that we need to go beyond Buddhist provincialism. We even complain about sectarianism among Buddhists. We also war with each other about such things whose Karmapa is the real one; which is better, gzhan stong or rang stong; is yogacara as high as madhayamaka or not; is Theravada Hinayāna or not; is Mahāyāna or the tantras the real teaching of the Buddha or not. If we do not go beyond these kinds of petty intellectual differences, we will never survive as a species and we will continue to destroy ourselves.

In the end it honestly does not matter much whether we put our faith in Jesus, Krishna or Buddha. There is no perfect faith that leads to liberation. The only thing that leads to liberation is knowledge of our true condition. When we know that state, we don't have need of faith since now we have certainty.

We do not need to ecumenically pretend that all paths lead to the same place. All we need to understand is that everyone is searching for the same thing, the peace and happiness that springs from freedom. We can overcome all our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe just by maintaining presence and awareness of this fact.

When we have overcome our own limitations regarding religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe, then we can work with any circumstances. If one is attached to some limitation, there is no way one can work well with circumstances. One can only work with circumstances by seeing what one's limitations are.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe then we are more free. We are more free to celebrate life, sorrow at death, wonder at creation, we are more free to enjoy our lives and the lives of others.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe we are more free to celebrate the threatening "other", to celebrate the beauty of human diversity and difference, which is the strength of our species.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe we are more free to act wisely, to cherish this beautiful planet we live on and all the richness of life, the plants, the animals, the rocks, minerals, oceans, mountains, rivers, and lakes it offers us.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe through knowing our own state through personal experience the universe and all the beings in it are revealed as an astonishing panoply of spheres of light and color, sound, lights and rays that has no boundary nor center.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe through knowing our own state just as it is, we have no need to ensure any creed, no need to confirm any ideology, no need to control anyone or anything -- we can let the free be free as they have been all along whether they know it or not.

When we overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe through direct and perfect knowledge of our own state, then, if we have the capacity, we can introduce others to their own state without regard to religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe.

If, for example, Dzogchen teachings are only for Buddhists, how can we ever hope to overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe? How can enforcing limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe ever be useful in the project of overcoming our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe?

Dzogchen teachings are for all who are interested. Because the ancient peoples of Zhang Zhung and Tibet were interested in Dzogchen, Dzogchen spread there before the formal advent of Buddhism in that country. Originally Dzogchen was not a formal part of Buddhism. It spread through a very small lineage of practitioners. This group of practitioners, beginning with Mañjuśrīmitra, saw that Dzogchen was the essence of what the Buddha was trying to communicate. So they spread it slowly. Later, because Padmasambhava, Vairocana and Vimalamitra brought it to Tibet and some Tibetans too understood it was the essence of the Buddha's teaching, they kept it in secret and it slowly spread among Tibetans. Then, in the 11-12th century, when the Nyingmapas gained self-awareness as an independent school, they adopted Dzogchen as their official "position" in competition with the new translation trends and incorporated it into their school. But by this time, Dzogchen had completely died out in India. But Dzogchen, as is proven by its presence in Bon, is not strictly the province of Buddhism. Though the Bonpos revised their teachings to bring them into line with Buddhist teachings, Zhang Zhung Nyengyud is an authentic line of Dzogchen intimate instruction that do not depend on Garab Dorje. Therefore, in the same way that early masters of Dzogchen were free from limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe and taught

Dzogchen to whoever came to them, we should also endeavor to overcome our limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe.

We must not consider the Dzogchen teachings as belonging to any religion, ideology, nation, class, race or tribe. Instead, as practitioners of Dzogchen, we should endeavor to overcome our personal limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe through knowing our real state just as it is. When we know our own state just as it is, we can engage with people wherever they are without ourselves throwing up any barriers of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe. So I suggest it is very important for Dzogchen practitioners, including myself, to overcome any limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe. We already have the means to do this -- we simply need to will to do it. If we ground ourselves in the deep natural transformation that comes from recognizing and integrating with our primordial potentiality, then we can go beyond the limitations of religion, ideology, nation, class, race and tribe. By going beyond these limitations (as well as the limitations of conceptuality, imputation, paths, stages, realizations, attainments, buddhas and sentient beings) through recognizing our own innate state that is originally pure and naturally formed, we can move freely through the world and meet everyone and everything from the authentic space of recognition of great original purity of all that is.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

I prefer to think that the Dzogchen practitioner can make use of all methods without regard to whether they are Buddhist or non-Buddhist.

Kilaya. said:

I agree, let's just think of NNR who regularly visited a Catholic church for years after arriving in Italy. But then again, Dzogchen seems to be totally intertwined with Tibetan Buddhism. No Dzogchen teacher will tell you it's okay to do guruyoga with Shiva or Jesus.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because Shiva and Jesus are not part of the transmission lineage, so it does not apply.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

heart said:

[

Dzogchen, or rather the Dzogchenpa, is a part of Buddhism as long as you use the Buddhist methods, even if it is "only" Anuyoga.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Since the first vehicle, according to the sgra thal gyur, is the vehicle of gods and men, are you stating that when a Dzogchenpa uses the methods of vehicles of gods and men they cease to be Buddhist?

I prefer to think that the Dzogchen practitioner can make use of all methods without regard to whether they are Buddhist or non-Buddhist. If you want to go to a kirtan, go. If you want to go to a Catholic service, go. If you want to go to a prayer meeting, go. If you want to dance with dervishes, go. If you want to attend a sweat lodge, go. If you want to hang out with a shaman, go. If you want to experiment once or twice with Ayuhuasca with a Brazilian shaman, go ahead. If you want to take peyote once or twice with a Mexican shaman, go ahead. If you want to spend time among Shaivite Sadhus, go ahead. If you want to hang out with Bonpos, go ahead. If you want to hang out with Brahmins, then like the Buddha himself, go ahead. Likewise, if you want to practice shrakvayāna methods, then go ahead. If you want to take refuge, and get a nice Tibetan name, then go ahead. If you want to practice Mahāyāna, then go ahead. If you want to take bodhisattva vows, then go ahead. If you want to practice the six levels of outer and inner tantra, then go ahead. Do you as Dzogchen practitioner have to do anything of these things? Nope. Should you criticize others for doing these things? Nope. What is indispensable for a Dzogchen practitioner in the tradition of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu? Ati Guru Yoga and that is all. Other teachers of Dzogchen will see things differently.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: neck trauma

Content:

Lobsang P. said:

Three months on from suffering a neck trauma I am still experiencing pain and limited movement. Most exercise seems to make it worse..any thoughts ?

Malcolm wrote:

It sounds like you have a serious inflammation of the tendons in your neck. You should

alternate hot and cold compresses and avoid anything that will cause more inflammation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: Any regular Mahamudra webcasts?

Content:

Astus said:

Mahamudra is not as bound to transmissions as Dzogchen,

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra, like Dzogchen, is dependent on direct introduction.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Inge said:

I've heard ChNN sometimes mention a remedy for rlung disorder consisting of good quality old wine and some other ingredients. Do you remember the other ingredients?

Malcolm wrote:

Butter I beleive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Having a fast track which only a few may be suited whilst the rest will have to make to with lesser 'means' sounds pretty elitist to me.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Is recognizing that different beings have differing needs and proclivities elitist? Do you not recognize that no matter what sphere we look at, either mundane or spiritual, beings have differing needs and proclivities? Whose fault is it that not all beings are xerox copies of each other? And is there even something wrong with the fact that they're not? Are some better or possessive of greater worth than others because of their differences?

There is no hegemony in Buddhism steering otherwise qualified people away from some

Dzogchen fast track only the privileged few can access. People are as free to pursue the direct way of Dzogchen as they feel they are. Wanna practice according to Dzogchen, go meet a Dzogchen guru. Can't find one near you or can't afford to travel to meet one? Can't afford some large, fixed donation for teachings that are available in your area? Can't find a teacher who will teach you Dzogchen straight away without first completing ngondro or some other preliminary? ChNN is a fully qualified master who gives it away for free to literally anyone with an internet connection and the interest and attention span to participate. Not very elitist at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I always have to chuckle when I see this charge of elitism being made. Anyone who is interested in Dzogchen and decides to meet a teacher and do practice is part of "the elite". Those who are not, are not. People self-select though their own karma.

I don't know how many people I have sent to ChNN. Then I see them later, "how is your practice going" . They reply, oh, I am studying with someone else. I am like, that is nice. People always cry about wanting to have realized teachers, and when there is one in the world, who really teaches Dzogchen just as it is, I am constantly amazed at people who just do not see the incredible value of ChNN in this day and age. I have come to the conclusion that people like limitations, it makes them feel comfortable.

Do I personally think Dzogchen is the bees knees, the most profound thing since sliced bread? Of course I do, that is way I spend most of my time studying and practicing it. All teachings have their value, even non-Buddhist teachings. I am especially fond of Kashmir Trika Shaivism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: garlic for lung

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Mashing is not cooking though, is it? I mean you mash it raw. Or do you mean boil and mash?

Malcolm wrote:

Boil and mash.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: garlic for lung

Content:

dakini_boi said:

If garlic is to be therapeutic in treating lung disorders, must it be raw?

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, what you ought to do is mash it.

Yu can get some Agar 35 from Siddhi energetics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 4:44 AM

Title: Dzogchen and the Two Stages

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

However, the purpose is to shift the mind and become the Yidam in the Yidam's world. The mind enters that reality totally so all phenomena are also real.

If the mind finally enters the mandala and remains there, it becomes that of an enlightened Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the function of a HYT mandala visualization. Without understanding the principle of the basis of purification, the result of purification, and the purifier, one has not understood the purpose of the creation stage on any level at all. And no one has 16 arms and four legs, for example, not one single human being alive, past or present. This is the reason, for example, that when doing completion stage practices, one generally uses the sahaja or natural form of the deity i.e. with one face and two arms and legs.

Secondly, as Nangwa pointed out, the principle of the completion stage, partially, is to break clinging to the mentally generated pure appearances of the creation stage. The generated mandala is only mind, meant to cut attachment to the world of the impure vision. It does not go beyond mind in any sense. In order to go beyond mind one needs the experience of the completion stage. When one is able to unify the two stages within one's practice, this is called the state of mahāmudra, in tantric terms.

Blue Garuda said:

What does Dzogchen offer that is greater?

Malcolm wrote:

It is said that if a butcher is given the explanation of Dzogchen they will achieve buddhahood more rapidly than a learned pandita who has never received any explanations of Dzogchen. So when explaining and teaching Dzogchen to an uneducated butcher, do we resort to complicated Buddhist words and topics? Do we belabor them with skandhas, dhātus and āyatana? No. We just explain their state to them in terms any one can easily grasp -- the five elements and body, speech and mind. These eight things are readily understood by anyone.

There is no need to spend years learning the forensics of dead medieval tenet systems that no one believes anymore merely to refute these topics with Madhyamaka reasonings

that everyone disagrees on. How pyrrhic this exercise is. Enjoyable, a past time, but ultimately a dead end.

Other people have brought up the issue of Dzogchen as a triumphalist position. But that is missing the point. What I brought up was the fact that much of what is studied in the "lower" vehicles can be passed over when learning Dzogchen.

People seem upset because Dzogchen does position itself both within and outside of the the nine vehicles. I did not invent this. One can read this very same thing in Norbu Rinpoche Crystal and the Way of Light:

"...there is a danger that some readers may make the false assumption that it implies a hierarchy of teachings with Dzogchen at the top. In fact, the whole layout could have been reversed with Dzogchen at the bottom; or the chart could be read from the bottom up which is the sequence in which the gradual paths are presented and practiced, each stage having to be completed before the next can be approached. Dzogchen differs from gradual paths because the master introduces the disciple directly to the Great Perfection, which is the heart of all paths. But the reason so many paths exist is that there is a teaching suited to the capacity of every individual. So, for example, for someone to whom sutra teaching is best suited, that teaching can be said be the "highest", because that teaching will work best for that individual. Any use of the words "high" and "highest" in relation to the Dzogchen teachings, should be read with this important proviso in mind." pg. 53

"Gradual paths insist that a practitioner must work from here upwards. Dzogchen, on the other hand, doesn't adopt a hierarchical approach; it proceeds right away on the basis of the master giving the student a Direct Introduction to the primordial state to enable the student to recognize that state for him or herself, and then remain in it.

Dzogchen is beyond limits, and the practices of any of the other levels can be used as secondary practices by a Dzogchen practitioner. But the principle practice of Dzogchen is to enter directly into a non-dual contemplation, and to remain in it, continuing to deepen it until one reaches total realization." pg. 175

My concern here in this thread is not defending Dzogchen as the highest. My interest in the OP's question has to do with certain features I have observed in reading original Dzogchen texts, and seeing that they consistently confirm and reinforce many things my teacher has said in the 36 years he has been teaching Dzogchen around the world.

I don't have a particular agenda in sharing these thoughts with people. I am a pretty open book and people have seen the evolution (or degeneration) of my thinking on various topics based on my study and practice. We have all been having a long conversation with each other for many years now. Sometimes my thoughts make people happy and sometimes they do not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 15th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Dzogchen abandons the dichotomy between mind and matter found in sutra and tantra. Theoretically, this is a most crucial difference. Because it abandons this dichotomy, it also abandons the dichotomy between the sentient and the non-sentient.

N

Blue Garuda said:

If you can find dichotomies in sutra and tantra perhaps it is because you have been conditioned to think that way. Certainly in self-generation in HYT there can be no dichotomy, surely.

Malcolm wrote:

Self-generation is a visualization practice. Nevertheless it still involves creating an inanimate container universe to support the inner mandala. However, the plants and trees and so on that one visualizes are simply that, a mental image, and mental creation and nothing more.

The dichotomy between mind and matter in scholastic Buddhism is well established. How many times has one seen defenses of rebirth predicated on the difference in kind between mind and matter? We find them in Abhidharma, Sutra and even Tantra (i.e. where the mind is held to be a rider on the energy of the body). And this is perfectly fine within the context of those teachings.

In Dzogchen on the other hand, mind is held to be generated by the *vāyus* in the body. In the Khandro Nyinthig Padmasambhava declares that mind and *vāyu* are just different names for the same thing:

"...the energy of that vivid luminosity arising as the diversity, that is called "*vāyu*", and it is called "mind". Though luminosity is called mind, because of movement, it is called "*vāyu*"

Mind, such as it is can be considered the subtle aspect of *vāyu*. But in reality, *vāyu*, the air element functioning in the human body, is what we call mind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Chulen - max 3 months?

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Should Chulen be taken for max 3 months at a time?

Malcolm wrote:

One can take chulen indefinately.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

I no longer believe that plants are insentient because I beleive the distinction between sentient and insentient is a false distinction. At least, it is a false distinction from a Dzogchen perspective. From the Dzogchen point of view, everything is made of five elements, all sentient beings, even consciousness, even the buddhas. Plants are every bit alive as animals. As Garab Dorje says "The color of rtsal is green". But because it is convenient and because they are ignorant of the principles of the basis, ideological vegetarians make a false distinction between sentient and non-sentient. There is, according to Dzogchen teachings, no true distinction to be made between the sentient and the non-sentient.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Wow, that is another little shock for me here - I'd been convinced for quite a few years that according to Dzogchen plants are very much insentient, and loads of old time practitioners would confirm what now turns out to be my misconception. Thanks for bringing up Garab Dorje and correcting it at last

Would you be so kind as to elaborate a bit more, though? What's the position of plants in samsara? Are there any available texts that deal with the matter?

Malcolm wrote:

According to our karmic vision plants are non-sentient. But according to Padmasambhava in the Khandro Nyinthig:

After first being created by the energy (rtsal) of wisdom, in the middle, as it was not recognized that the body of the refined part of the assembled elements actually is the five wisdoms, since this was not realized through intellectual views, the non-sentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it... As such, the sign of non-duality is [the body] disappearing into wisdom without any effluents because the critical point of the non-duality or sameness of the non-sentient and the sentient was understood according to the Guru's intimate instructions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Dzogchen abandons the dichotomy between mind and matter found in sutra and tantra. Theoretically, this is a most crucial difference. Because it abandons this dichotomy, it also abandons the dichotomy between the sentient and the non-sentient.

N

Matylda said:

But then it sounds like zen teaching... I think Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche does not like it. Then what about the view? If it is only the mind body issue doesn't it implicate only the difference in the method? Then some would not agree again.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN likes Chan/Zen just fine.

I am not sure I understand the rest of your question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

pensum said:

i find it fascinating that so many people seem to be omniscient and know what is best for other individuals at their stage in life, understanding and practice. almost everyone, whether Buddhist, Dzogchenpa, Nyingma, Kagyupa, Gelugpa, Sakyapa, Theravada, Mahayana, Zen, Shingon, Jodo Shinshu, Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Hindu, etc. etc. all claim that their path is the best or only true path. being an ignorant old fool i don't doubt that for them whatever path they are on is the best path, as it is the result of their own individual karma. so many of the world's ills and problems seem to arise however from assuming that you are the only person in the world and everyone else is simply your clone and either ignorant, evil or damned for not seeing or admitting that fact and that yours is the one true path. well, count me among the damned for i can't help but feel that those scriptural statements that there are as many paths as there are individuals have a basis in fact.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is correct. This is why it is crucial that Dzogchen be presented as a path

available to all without any restriction other than their interest.

Buddhism has become in many respects an ossified missionary religion primarily concerned with gaining converts and worshipping in nice houses. Now, don't get me wrong, I like nice houses, but it seems to me that by and large nice houses have become more important than the Dharma they are supposed to house. All that is Buddhist is not necessarily Dharma. All that is Dharma is not necessarily Buddhist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

I just don't think it's for me, and I say that after a long and rigorous investigation. And that has nothing to do with my mental and intellectual abilities, it's just what I see as an effective vehicle for me, one where I will make the most progress with.

As I see it Dzogchen was an add-on, a stage that you reached after you did the hard yards, once your arse was already calloused from meditation and all those "unnecessary" things.

Malcolm wrote:

A Dzogchen practitioner's fundamental responsibility is to understand their own condition. They may use any and all useful methods from the nine-yānas, or even non-Buddhist traditions like hatha yoga to better integrate with their own state. So for example, if someone is having obstacles, then perhaps they should focus on Tara or Guru Drag Phur. Since Manjushri is the state of the realization described in the 80th chapter of the Self-Arisen Vidyā tantra, someone who wishes to understand Dzogchen in general better might concentrate on a Manjushri cycle such as Manjushrivadasimha, etc. If someone needs to extend their life, they should rely on Amitayus or Mandarava or White Tara.

There is no limitation on what a Dzogchen practitioner can practice. We can study the Yoga Sutras for example, since they are interesting and have valuable advice on meditation practice. There are no limitations apart from those we impose on ourselves and others. The function of Dzogchen, Mahāmudra, Perfection of Wisdom is to transcend limitations, not to stay bound in them.

The idea that Dzogchen is an "add-on" is not the perspective of Dzogchen tantras or Garab Dorje himself. This is a later gradualist view that was largely promulgated as a response to criticisms of the Sarma schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Bhusuku said:

And if Dzogchen contradicts the sutra/tantra teachings even on such basic buddhist doctrines, what is actually the use of studying sutra teachings at all for someone who's mainly interested in Dzogchen? I mean, isn't it actually a waste of time studying Abhidharma, if later on you realize that the Dzogchen teachings have a complete different POV on many Abhidharma subjects? The same applies for studying Madhyamaka: why waste many years to gain an in depth understanding of the two truths if later on you realize that there's only one truth in Dzogchen?

heart said:

In what way does Dzogchen contradict the sutra and tantra teachings?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen abandons the dichotomy between mind and matter found in sutra and tantra. Theoretically, this is a most crucial difference. Because it abandons this dichotomy, it also abandons the dichotomy between the sentient and the non-sentient.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

And just like it happened that all these incredibly important ideals and means have been reduced to a money making scam, you will find that it will also (has already started to) happen to Dzogchen. Then what will you do? Look for something new and untainted until that is worn thin again?

Malcolm wrote:

I will recommend that someone find an authentic teacher of Dzogchen, if that is their interest. Then this is sufficient. I can't help what con artists who sell the name "Dzogchen" to make money do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

mindyourmind said:

This whole Ati-lite thing is getting on my nerves. Read something like "Blazing Splendor" and see how Dzogchen should be studied.

Malcolm wrote:

The state of Dzogchen is Buddhahood. Whoever practices Dzogchen is trying to integrate with that state. A Dzogchen without Buddhism is not possible, since Dzogchen represents the goal of all paths, whether non-Buddhist or Buddhist. That goal is buddahood or full awakening.

"My vehicles are inconceivable,
when summarized, are included in two, samsara and nirvana"

-- The Tantra of Self-Arisen Vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Bhusuku said:

Thanks, Namdrol! This is interesting, since by taking ChNN's words about always going to the essence to heart I came more and more to the same conclusion.

Namdrol said:

as far as Tantra goes, anuyoga is sufficient.

Bhusuku said:

If that's the case, why is it that the Precious Vase explains Atiyoga more from the Mahayoga POV? Doesn't that approach make things unnecessary more complicated?

Malcolm wrote:

The Precious Vase is based on Padmasambhava's Man ngag lta ba phreng ba, that is why.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Namdrol said:

...I have been moving slowly toward the pov of view that for most people studying these lower yānas is a complete waste of time...

gregkavarnos said:

This is coming from a man who spent decades studying the lower yana.

My dear N. as it ever occurred to you that it was as a consequence of decades of causal path practices that you accumulated the merit to be able to fully understand and

practice (and even teach) Dzogchen? Or maybe you don't believe in karma now either? Is that why you are suddenly open to non-Buddhist practices and traditions? I mean a month ago you took Jax to pieces for saying something very similar (albeit that Jax also negated the need for a guru) and now you are suddenly sounding all new-age and ecumenical. It's been a while since you have seen your guru tete-a-tete, hasn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Greg:

Since Dzogchen tantras reject the body/mind dualism of the lower yānas, it makes it hard for people fed on the lower yānas to appreciate Dzogchen. Since this is so, the need to study in detail the lower yānas is limited. Someone who is planning to be a teacher needs to know these things, but practitioners, not necessarily. I have seen in my own studies how my Buddhist conditioning has made it difficult at times for me to understand certain key points of Dzogchen teachings.

As far as the ecumenical thing goes -- I have come to the conclusion that Dzogchen is for all who are interested. Not a "Dzogchen without Buddhism" if you will. But I see no good reason why interested Hindus, Christians, Moslems, and so on cannot receive Dzogchen teachings and practice them. Dzogchen may have come from Buddhism, but as we see in Bon, Dzogchen is not just for Buddhists.

Dzogchen is for everyone who is interested to learn about it and then practice it. When someone comes to my teacher to learn Dzogchen, he never says "Now you must nominally become a Buddhist in order to study Dzogchen". He says "In order to study and learn about Dzogchen you must receive direct introduction", that is all.

The Buddha never said anywhere in the sutras "In order to study the Dharma, first you must take refuge". The whole refuge thing has been turned into a game of religious politics. When people took refuge in the Buddha they did so merely out of their gratitude for teachings they received. You can read about this in many places in the Pali canon.

These days, refuge has been turned into a badge, a tool for conversion. It has been turned into a ritual. But how many people change their name into something nice like Kunga Namdrol, or Padma Tsering, etc., etc., without changing anything in their hearts? Refuge ceremonies have just become empty baptisms that people think are hugely important but actually change nothing. It is the same with bodhisattva vow ceremonies and also empowerments.

But in Dzogchen there is nothing to convert or change or alter. Buddhahood is an innate attribute of all sentient beings, so what is the point of "becoming a Buddhist?"

People like to say "Did you go for refuge? What is your Dharma name?", "How long have you been a Buddhist?", "Who is your refuge teacher?", "Did you take bodhisattva vows?", "Did you receive initiation?", etc. None of this is the principle of Dzogchen teachings as I

understand it. None of these things taken in and of themselves are bad, BTW, there is nothing wrong with having gone for refuge to the Three Jewels, created bodhicitta, taken initiation and so on. But it is better to penetrate to the essence of these things rather than just leave them as empty forms, which sadly today they mostly have become.

But the principle of entering Dzogchen teachings is none of the above. The principle of entering Dzogchen teachings is solely direct introduction. And my teacher, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, will give that to anyone who is interested in receiving the teachings of Dzogchen regardless of their race, color, creed, gender or gender orientation.

The principle of practicing Dzogchen teachings, according to my teacher, is integrating with your primordial state through Ati Guru Yoga and deepening your knowledge of that state through various kinds of practices. Anyone who is interested can do this without having to consider themselves a "Buddhist".

As far as being open to non-Buddhist practices -- it is the case that people who belong to other religions might become interested in Dzogchen teachings. I see no reason at all why they should give up those practices merely because they are interested in Dzogchen teachings. Granted, it is impossible to reconcile sacrificing animals with Dzogchen teachings, but apart from that, I do not see the problem. If some Christian is practicing Ati Guru Yoga, then they are practicing Dzogchen whether they consider themselves Buddhists or not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 12:42 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

mindyourmind said:

That "skillful means, if such it is, contributes to the demand side of the problem, that "skillful means" creates another cause for an animal to be slaughtered. It remains participation in the process.

Malcolm wrote:

We should work with circumstances. As for myself, I will choose to create positive causes for the liberation of sentient beings by any means possible. You are free to refuse to do so, if that is your choice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 6:46 AM

Title: Re: esoteric meaning for the three jewels

Content:

anjali said:

I was wondering about an esoteric meaning for the triple jewels: Buddham saranam gachammi; Dharmam saranam gachammi; Sangham saranam gachammi.

Is it acceptable to view the three refugees in the following way? "Buddham" represents the nature of mind, the cognizant, awake quality. "Dharmam" represents the essence of mind, the empty quality. "Sangham" represents the embodiment of the Dharma, the unconfined capacity of the mind. Thus, taking refuge would be taking refuge in one's own trikaya nature.

If the three jewels are talked about in this way somewhere, any pointers would be greatly appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

Usually buddha = emptiness

dharma = clarity

sangha = union of clarity and emptiness

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Withdrawing from that process, whether it helps the big picture in an infinitesimal degree or whether it actually makes a difference to that big picture, makes a difference to that practitioner, or at least it should.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I am not communicating well enough -- refusing to eat meat is withdrawing from the process. If you eat meat with the proper method, you can help that creature whose meat you are eating meet the causes for liberation.

If you tie a protection cord on it, or sing the six syllables of Samantabhadra to it while it is alive, there is benefit. We cannot always be there in time to help the living, but we can help the deceased with the method of eating meat with compassion, awareness and presence.

So from my point of view, refusing to eat meat in such a way is withdrawing, because the consequence of not eating meat is that that animal will never make a good connection for their eventual liberation.

So our intention is the same, our method is different, my method includes yours; yours lacks a skillful means for "food" animals that have already been slaughtered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 5:22 AM

Title: Dzogchen and Buddhism

Content:

Bhusuku said:

And if Dzogchen contradicts the sutra/tantra teachings even on such basic buddhist doctrines, what is actually the use of studying sutra teachings at all for someone who's mainly interested in Dzogchen? I mean, isn't it actually a waste of time studying Abhidharma, if later on you realize that the Dzogchen teachings have a complete different POV on many Abhidharma subjects? The same applies for studying Madhyamaka: why waste many years to gain an in depth understanding of the two truths if later on you realize that there's only one truth in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very good question. I have been moving slowly toward the pov of view that for most people studying these lower yānas is a complete waste of time. Oh, it can be useful to study a bit of Abhidharma because it helps contextualize mandala practice, and Madhyamaka does help cut through intellectual proliferation, properly studied and absorbed. Studying a bit of Madhyamaka helps one avoid the pitfal of crypto-advaita.

Also places where Dzogchen differs from sutra and tantra will not be readily understood if one does not have at least some superficial familiarity with them.

You don't really need to study all this sutra stuff to understand Dzogchen, and as far as Tantra goes, anuyoga is sufficient. On the other hand, also a practitioner needs to understand that nothing really limits their practice to so called "Dzogchen practice" -- anything at all whether from Buddhist or non-Buddhist sources like Yoga, etc., can be incorporated into Dzogchen practitioner's life. One can even participate in a non-Buddhist religion, if for some reason that is necessary.

I personally think one will understand Dzogchen much better if one is grounded in sutra and tantra, but no, it is not completely necessary to learn these things. Understanding the five elements, three gates, emptiness, and bodhicitta are about all one needs at bare minimum. That, and a realized Guru -- and those are in rather short supply.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Devotion is the most critical aspect

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so. Certainty in your knowledge of the primordial state is the most critical aspect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Lasik Surgery and Thogal

Content:

Clarence said:

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

I should have added, this is only to be done if you have not begun this practice. If you have started, as someone pointed out to me privately in an email, you ought not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Meekly accepting that an animal is dead, that the shelf is full of meat so I may as well eat it is hardly a helpful approach.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing meek about me. I deliberately eat meat, when I eat meat, in order to create a positive cause for that animal's eventual liberation. When all is said and done that is my motive.

I also sponsor freeing of animals, and so on.

There is no way to lessen the suffering of samsara for others, however, by such means as freeing animals and so on. The best you can do is conquer your own samsara.

However, through using a method coming from one of the six liberations (sight, sound, smell, taste, hearing, touch etc.) you can benefit other sentient beings so that they too one day may receive teachings and achieve liberation. That is where I am coming from.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:
mindyourmind said:
Change the world ...one practitioner at a time, one steer at a time

Malcolm wrote:
And the central question really is -- how do you benefit some steer that has already been slaughtered? Praying?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 4:10 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
PadmaVonSamba said:
...

If you don't realize your own true mind, it doesn't matter what goes into your belly or where it came from. You may save a herd of cattle in this lifetime, and that will be a very good thing, but that will be all you save.

mindyourmind said:
What if you can do both - realize your own true mind and save a herd of cattle? Why the false dichotomy?

Malcolm wrote:
If you can do both, great. But when you prevent the slaughter of 10 steers, you hasten the slaughter of ten more. So what to do? And the central question really is -- how do you benefit some steer that has already been slaughtered? Praying?

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 3:04 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
Namdrol said:

I will state that, based on my understanding of Dzogchen teachings, those Buddhist scholastics who argued that plants were not alive, equivalent with rocks and crystals, were wrong in their understanding.

Bhusuku said:
"Buddhist scholastics"? Didn't the Buddha himself taught this?

Malcolm wrote:
No, he did not teach this. Read the Schmithausen monograph.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 14th, 2012 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

mindyourmind said:

And yes, I believe that there is a great, real and rather obvious difference. For starters we can start with the amount of suffering involved. If someone is going to, with a straight face, try to convince me that the "suffering" undergone by a truckful of cabbage is anything approximating that undergone by say a truckload of pigs, well then I have very little else to say, and it would be best for at least the rules of this forum if we leave the debate just there.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it seems that your criteria of suffering is a little limited and only addresses the suffering of suffering.

mindyourmind said:

Raising, killing and eating an animal is just simply involving more suffering than even the worst case scenario of the amount of bugs we kill in producing a non-meat meal.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think the suffering of a mammal is qualitatively or quantitatively greater than the suffering of an insect -- I know that some Buddhists make this (false) distinction, but the monastic penalty for killing an insect is no less than that of killing a cow -- it merely requires confession. What this says to me is that Buddha valued the life of all creatures equally regardless of phyla. Destroying vegetation, especially seeds, is also included in this class of vows, as is digging in the ground.

mindyourmind said:

Remember also that some of those same bugs are also killed in the process of slaughtering an animal.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

mindyourmind said:

Part of that precise answer would, in addition to suffering, most definitely deal with the presence or absence of a central nervous system, although if you will that could be a duplication of the suffering argument.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a value judgment you are making that does not have an objective base.

It is a certainly the case that in Early Buddhism the issue was not so clear cut among Buddhists. Coming from a common Vedic Heritage where plants are considered fully qualified animate beings, early Buddhists also held this view. Only later, under the influence of scholastic dogmatism, did Buddhist philosophers begin to argue plants were non-sentient. The Buddhist arguments against plant life being sentient are quite late, motivated it seems mainly to defend Buddhist from criticisms from Jains and Hindus. Lambert Schmithausen wrote a long and interesting article about this and concludes (<http://www.scribd.com/doc/78950014/The-Problem-of-the-Sentience-of-Plants-in-Earliest-Buddhism> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;):

But as stated above (§ 5.2 and n. 204) a few sources suggest yet another motivation, viz. that plants should not be injured or destroyed because they are the abode or habitat of animal s (cp. also the analogous motivation not to pollute water in § 11.1). This ecological argument is fully valid today also, indeed more than ever before, and for both monks and lay people.

39.2 However, I for one should find it reasonable to combine this latter argument with a different view of the nature of plants - one that is perhaps not too far from what I hope I have been able to show to have been, with some probability, that of earliest Buddhism: the view that plants themselves, too, are living beings, in the sense of a border-line case. But contrary to the situation in earliest Buddhism where the border-line status of plants served to reduce inhibitions against injuring them, it should now be used to re-establish them. In this sense, we should rather stress the other aspect of the border-line status: Plants are, to be sure, not living beings like animals, and not at all living beings like men, with some secret anthropomorphic features and faculties, and hence perhaps not sentient beings in the usual sense of the word; but not entirely insentient either, not altogether insusceptible of being injured; living beings of a peculiar kind, which we can somehow explore from outside, but which we will probably never be able to "understand" from within; familiar beings, but at the same time utterly strange, and precisely for that reason to be treated with respect: because we simply do not know, and perhaps cannot even imagine, what it means for a plant itself to be injured. To be sure, unless we are ready to starve, we cannot avoid using plants, and this often means: injuring or even killing them. But we should do this as little as possible, carefully and with a sense of regret, not with the unnecessary brutality and relentlessness which has become habitual, and at the root of which is mostly not need but greed.

mindyourmind said:

This whole argument equating animal sentience with plant "sentience" is simply a last-ditch, desperate and rather unbecoming argument, designed to defend our choices as meat-eaters.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not equate the two. I merely pointed out that I no longer believe that anything imbued with prāṇa can possibly be non-sentient. Plants possess prāṇa, therefore, they

are alive, therefore, after some fashion, I must accept that they too are sentient. Not only to plants possess prāṇa, but they also possess ojas, mdangs, they also possess the seven phase digestive process that we humans and all animals do. They take food, they break it down, is it conducted by fluid within plant membranes where it builds their flesh, their soft tissue, hard tissues and finally in the end they produce sap, flowers, seeds, etc.

I will state that, based on my understanding of Dzogchen teachings, those Buddhist scholastics who argued that plants were not alive, equivalent with rocks and crystals, were wrong in their understanding.

mindyourmind said:

I accept without any reservation that a vegetarian meal involves death and suffering, but not more so, or even equal, than the death and suffering involved in eating meat.

Again, I respect everyone's choice in what they eat and do not eat, and what you eat or not will not liberate you, but let's not make stuff up to make us feel better.

Malcolm wrote:

When growing plants in the large quantities made necessary by the increasing population of our planet is made possible only through the use of animal-based fertilizers that come from the death of animals in the billions, such as in organic agriculture, or the petrochemical fertilizers/pesticides/herbicides that contaminate the environment and poison billions of birds and insects, such as in conventional cultivation, there is no solid argument that can be made that a vegetarian diet, even a so called organic veg is less harmful to animals than a non-vegetarian diet. It simple does not add up.

So let us not pretend that being a vegetarian is intrinsically more moral or better than being an omnivore. Vegetarians who argue in that way are simply being false brahmins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Lasik Surgery and Thogal

Content:

Clarence said:

N-la,

Do you know if Lasik surgery on the eyes make Thogal practice impossible or more difficult or are there no consequences on practice after the surgery?

Many thanks,

Clarence

Malcolm wrote:
Should have no effect.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 11:49 PM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
mindyourmind said:
There is a qualitative difference then, even on this argument, between plant sentience and animal sentience.

Malcolm wrote:
Really, what is the difference? Visible sense organs? A so called "nervous system"?

It simply won't do to call something an "obsfucation" merely because you disagree with someone's opinion.

You are a lawyer, be precise.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 11:21 PM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
mindyourmind said:
What I never understood, and have no real hope of ever understanding, is why these enlightened practitioners must actually participate in killing a sentient being to improve its lot. Surely such a practitioner can benefit such a being by simply saying mantras, or another practice - other than participating in killing it.

Malcolm wrote:
Killing, the taking of life, requires the intent to take life, an object, the carrying out of the action and satisfaction in doing so.

mindyourmind said:
In other words, a human that is so advanced that he or she can actually directly choose to benefit another being should be able to do so through other means than participating in the killing of that being.

Malcolm wrote:
Eating meat does not equate with killing unless you killed the meat you are eating, or asked that it be killed for you.

However, whenever we eat anything at all we are participating in the death of something

else. This is a simple fact of life. When we harvest grain, we destroy the homes and lives of many creatures. We participate in their death when we eat oats, wheat, not to mention the death of the plants in question, etc. To live is to participate in the death of other beings, both plant and animal.

Many vegetarians argue the deaths caused by agriculture is unavoidable. And I agree with them. But they never accept responsibility for the deaths of creatures caused by agriculture, and do their best to pretend they have no karmic responsibility for them.

When a piece of meat is available in a restaurant, its death is unavoidable. Why? Because it is dead. It has been slaughtered already. It has been packaged and sold. But I did not kill that animal. I no more killed that animal than our vegetarian friends killed all the insects and birds that die in the large scale production of rice harvested by machines in Lundberg Farms. For example, feathermeal is one of the main products Lundberg Farms uses in organic rice production. Feathermeal, in case you were wondering, is described as follows:

Feather meal is a byproduct of processing poultry; it is made from poultry feathers by partially hydrolyzing them under elevated heat and pressure, and then grinding and drying. Although total nitrogen levels are fairly high (up to 12%), the bioavailability of this nitrogen may be low. Feather meal is used in formulated animal feed and in organic fertilizer.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Feather_meal " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Now, how can vegetarians, who suppose they eat a diet free from animal products, possibly excuse themselves when they eat rice and other kinds of large scale organic produce? Feathermeal is pervasively used in the cultivation of organic crops. Feathermeal is a by-product of the poultry industry. The feathers of those chickens in those truly hellish chicken factories get ground up and used in "organic" fertilizer. Feathermeal is also fed to steers in industrial beef operations.

Another common organic fertilizer is blood meal. Another one is bone meal. What about manure? All of these are used pervasively in growing organic produce. What about Biodynamic farming? This is another form of organic food production that depends heavily on the use of animal products in production of organic foods.

I can refuse to eat that piece of meat or fish, but that organic bread too comes at the cost of life, as does the rice, and the asparagus. All food comes at the cost of life. The cost of life is death. There is no food that does not come at the cost of life.

One need not be "advanced" to benefit some animal whose meat you are consuming. In fact, to benefit those with whom one does not have direct contact in some way is impossible on a merely mental level unless you are an awakened person. For example, this is the reason ordinary people cannot successfully do Phowa for others. They simply do not have the yogic capacity to eject the consciousness of another being from its

body (these days there are many arrogant people who run around and pretend to do phowa for others, deceiving the relatives and accepting money for their deceptions)

When you eat meat with compassion, presence and awareness, and use a mantra like the six spaces of Samantabhadra, you create a positive cause for that animal specifically, and if you are eating a vegetarian meal, a specific positive cause for any animal who was killed during the harvesting of that crop. This works for ordinary people best because one is making a concrete physical connection with those animals through tsal.

I no longer believe that plants are insentient because I believe the distinction between sentient and insentient is a false distinction. At least, it is a false distinction from a Dzogchen perspective. From the Dzogchen point of view, everything is made of five elements, all sentient beings, even consciousness, even the buddhas. Plants are every bit alive as animals. As Garab Dorje says "The color of rtsal is green". But because it is convenient and because they are ignorant of the principles of the basis, ideological vegetarians make a false distinction between sentient and non-sentient. There is, according to Dzogchen teachings, no true distinction to be made between the sentient and the non-sentient. Therefore we must respect all life, not just the life that is convenient for us to respect. Even though we must respect all life, life must be taken for other life to flourish. This is simply how samsara is. Therefore whenever we eat, and no matter what we eat, we must do so with compassion, presence and awareness because all food comes at the cost of something's life.

Everytime we consume the flesh of something we are incorporating that being's vital energy into our own, whether it is plant or an animal. When we die, our vital energy, our rtsal, contributes to the growth and health of other creatures. This is the natural cycle of life.

Thus one simply has to be mindful and attentive, present and aware. If one eats without presence and awareness, even eating a tomato becomes a non-virtue. If one eats with presence and awareness, even eating meat becomes a virtue.

mindyourmind said:

...but let's just be very honest about this popular "defense" of eating meat.

Malcolm wrote:

I am being very honest about this extremely unpopular advocacy of meat-eating -- because in the end it is not about meat, it is about compassion, presence and awareness. I know that many people with more conventional Mahāyāna views about meat-eating, not to mention fanatical vegans and so on, will find this principle, if not just counter-intuitive, completely unacceptable.

So people like to mention Chatral Rinpoche, and so on. But they are not speaking from the point of view of Dzogchen. They are speaking from the point of view of common Mahāyāna. As I have said many times, this is fine. But it is not the point of view of Dzogchen teachings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

...

If you don't realize your own true mind, it doesn't matter what goes into your belly or where it came from. You may save a herd of cattle in this lifetime, and that will be a very good thing, but that will be all you save.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I have also read that the Dalai Lama supports vegetarianism but feels he cannot be vegetarian due to his health.

namdrol - are you saying that he does or does not understand and practice Dzogchen?

Namdrol said:

I am quite certain HHDL understands and practices Dzogchen. I am certain it is his primary practice.

N

Blue Garuda said:

In which case why does he not preach like ChNNR that vegetarianism is a miserable form of compassion?

Malcolm wrote:

You will have to ask him. ChNN's point of view is not for everyone. One either agrees or disagrees. But he thinks it important enough to bring it up at nearly every retreat.

Also, HHDL is under a lot of pressure from a lot of people to conform to their view of him.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Meaning of 'brang rgyas (Tibetan)

Content:

Totoro said:

Hi

Could someone please tell me the meaning of this term 'brang rgyas used in Tantric sadhanas? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Need more context. But it can mean "full breasted".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

-- Not eating meat is more than just an ego trip. It really contributes to prevent suffering...

Malcolm wrote:

No it doesn't, not even one tiny bit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

There is a lot of quoting from orthodoxy here. I wonder if it would be possible to talk from experience?

Malcolm wrote:

I was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I have also read that the Dalai Lama supports vegetarianism but feels he cannot be vegetarian due to his health.

namdrol - are you saying that he does or does not understand and practice Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite certain HHDL understands and practices Dzogchen. I am certain it is his primary practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

Andrew108 said:

I know it seems heretical to say this but perhaps after a while one needs to disconnect from the idea of guru and also the idea of union.

Whilst connecting through guru yoga is indeed necessary initially, I wonder if it isn't as important to disconnect at some point.

But I'm talking here of a deeper level to the practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is the essence of practice. As you discover your nature, you just integrate more with your gurus state of realization.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

I don't agree with this perspective. When a practitioner eats meat with presence and awareness, there is a connection made with that sentient being that serves to benefit that animal.

Thrasymachus said:

That is typical win(for the practitioner of carnism) and lose(for the dead animal). I don't see it like that at all. Why would a being that died for your food care about how enlightened, present or aware you are or aren't, what religion or doctrine you follow? The only doctrine they would care about is that which benefits them also -- and not just you.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you are not a Dzogchen practitioner presumably, so I guess you perhaps do not understand the function of rtsal. Everything is connected through rtsal, plants, animals, rocks, people and so on. Since there is benefit to practitioners, there is also benefit to the animals. But not of course, if you eat in a state of ignorance and lack of attention.

The same goes for eating a tomato, or a piece of lettuce, one has to be aware of the sentient beings who died bringing that peice of food to your plate-- whether one eats the flesh an animal or the flesh of a tomato one must eat with presence and awareness.

practitioner said:

Clearly HHDL, HH Karmapa, Chatral Rinpoche, etc. are just practicing at a lower level than those who facilitate the killing of sentient beings "out of compassion"...

Malcolm wrote:

Now, as I said, I do not object to people who wish to follow a vegetarian or vegan lifestyle for health, political, environmental, or spiritual reasons. I do not object to people who wish to follow common Mahāyāna. But as I mentioned, one who is going to follow common Mahāyāna must also eschew garlic, onion, alchohol and so on.

And as I mentioned above, His Holiness The Dalai Lama is not a vegetarian -- though in Dharmasala he maintains a vegetarian kitchen. He has also scolded people for bringing him vegetarian dishes while he is on the road, and he eats meat for his health, according to the instructions of his Tibetan doctors.

Niether the Karmapa nor Chatral Rinpoche are gurus of mine. My guru is Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. I follow his teachings on this subject and no one else's. You may not like him, you may not agree with him, but what I have said is basically his point of view on the subject. He considers the compassion argument for vegetarianism a "miserable compassion". He is quite emphatic on this point and brings it up at nearly every retreat.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 7:49 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the Dalai Lama...

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dalai Lama is not a vegetarian.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 9:26 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

But you we are physiologically and ethically capable of extending compassion to

animals by not killing many animals by refusing meat.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this perspective. When a practitioner eats meat with presence and awareness, there is a connection made with that sentient being that serves to benefit that animal.

You do not have to accept this point of view for yourself, but it is my point of view.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

You search for manipulated facts to make meat eating more acceptable. For example earlier you railed on soy, citing this article: <http://civileats.com/2009/01/27/a-vegan-reassesses-soy-a-health-and-environmental-perspective/> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

But that article itself mentioned most soy, 80%, goes to feed livestock.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not eat industrially produced meat for environmental as well as ethical reasons. I made that clear.

Thrasymachus said:

So counting the forest so essential to this "ideal" meat eating enterprise, you can only feed about 2 people per 10 acres.

Malcolm wrote:

Where do you derive this figure from?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 13th, 2012 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

It seems alot of people here are using a fundamentalist Buddhist approach to justify meat eating.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Not at all. As with everything, there are a number of views about meat-eating in Buddhism. In my case, it has nothing to do with the traditional diet of Tibetans.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Which of the two questions are you answering no to? Coz it makes a HUGE difference!

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is the sole path of all the buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Is Guru Yoga necessary?

Content:

Kelwin said:

Ok, let's invert the question this time. Is Guru Yoga necessary? Can we reach accomplishment without it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: recent Jogye controversy

Content:

mindyourmind said:

People having fun.

How dare they

Malcolm wrote:

I know, what is the world coming too, meat eating, and now this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: recent Jogye controversy

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

The leader of South Korea's biggest Buddhist order has apologised after monks were filmed apparently gambling illegally. Six leaders of the Jogye order offered to resign on Thursday after the secretly-filmed footage emerged. Film apparently showing monks playing poker at a luxury hotel, some smoking and drinking, was aired on television....
More here:

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-18030813> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Ha! Back in the early '90's there was a strip joint (The Naked Eye) where some strippers that were friends of mine used to work in Boston in the Combat Zone. One night a friend and I headed down there for a drink and five Korean monks, in their monastic dress, who were staying at the Cambridge Zen Center walked out of the place as we were walking in. Our friend, who has dancing that evening, told us they had left her the best tip she had had so far that night.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Care to elucidate?

Malcolm wrote:

The five outer course elements are made out of the five lights of the wisdom of rigpa. Everything (all sentient beings including their consciousness as well as everything we consider inanimate) is made out of the five elements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 12th, 2012 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

But when you buy meat at the meat store, whatever "being" once lived in that meat already moved out of that house long ago. There is no karma from buying or eating this meat...

Malcolm wrote:

This is also Bhavaviveka's perspective.

The truth is that Christians, Moslems, Jews, and Secularists will never stop eating meat. They will never stop raising animals for food. If practitioners refuse to eat meat, they are refusing to create a good cause for the animal whose flesh they are eating.

There is no need to suppose we must therefore decide to eat every kind of dead creature and so on. We can work within the convention of what are considered food animals in our culture and society, i.e. poultry, beef, pork, lamb, goat, venison, wild game, fish and shellfish. It is also ok to enjoy the taste and the flavor of these kinds of foods. We have sense organs, we should enjoy what we eat. We should also be aware, we should not be blind to suffering. Also when we eat a salad, or a tomato, we have to be aware of the suffering the production of that tomato or lettuce, or head of broccoli engenders. When we pick a tomato, we are also picking someone else's food, the food of another creature. When we eat a strawberry, we are stealing it from some bird, chipmunk or insect. When we buy mass produced vegetables in a market, how many creatures died to produce that? When we use sesame oil to cook our vegetarian meal, how many millions of small creatures were crushed to death to extract that sesame oil? The idea that being a vegetarian is less harmful to sentient beings than being a meat eater is deluded. You can, for example, in the same cycle of treasure texts find one text that says you must avoid meat, and in another text from the same cycle, instructions that one must eat meat.

If you have a specific reason for being a vegetarian, for example, you are doing chulen (rasāyana) practice -- then you must avoid all foods that give rise to the three humors and focus only on sattvic foods, essence foods, such as ghee, honey, rice, fruits, etc. You cannot eat garlic, onion, radishes, etc., roots in general. This also has to do with how to cleanse the digestive pathways in the formation of the various tissues of the body. Even so, there are tantras that identify meat as rasāyana, chulen. So meat can even be used for chulen practice.

If one is a Dzogchen practitioner, there are no rules about what one may eat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Everything is made out of rigpa.

Isn't this a case of considering butter to be milk?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

It's quite clear that most humanoids on this planet are currently devolving.

Adamantine said:

Well, yeah.. I haven't invested a great deal of time studying evolutionary theory but I imagine there are allowances for population explosions and bottlenecks of everything from virulent plants, insects, and rodents to humans.. any lifeforms that get way out of proportion and balance with the environment can end up altering it drastically, and eventually be the cause for their own demise potentially. I would just assume this must be an aspect of "evolutionary" theory, and if not than it is quite deficient.

On another note, Guru Rinpoche's prophecies do seem to be right on target, and I don't think he was subjecting his forward gaze to evolutionary models..

There's theory, and then there's omniscience.. I am aiming for the latter.. for now though I may have to dabble in the former.. sigh

Malcolm wrote:

"Evolution is any change across successive generations in the heritable characteristics of biological populations. Evolutionary processes give rise to diversity at every level of biological organisation, including species, individual organisms and molecules such as DNA and proteins."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

practitioner said:

Butcher ---> Purchaser = bad karma

Butcher ---> Market ---> Purchaser = no problem

Malcolm wrote:

The argument is, and it is the Buddha's argument, recall, that meat that was not slaughtered for you specifically, that you have not seen slaughtered, and did not request slaughtered is pure. In case someone feels this is merely a Hinayāna argument, let me also remind you that the Madhyamaka author Bhavaviveka also follows the same argument. Shantideva of course is well known for arguing against meat eating.

While it is true that the lower tantras instruct us that to be vegetarian -- tantras like Hevajra instruct us in the opposite fashion.

So, again, it all depends on what you personally want to practice.

I am a Dzogchen Community practitioner, therefore I practice according to that tradition. I believe that refusing to eat meat is a refusal to extend one's compassion.

In the end, we are all food. Get used to it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I mean the animal is still be raised to be slaughtered in order to fulfil your attachment to the taste of flesh. Environmentally it may be better but ethically???

Malcolm wrote:

When meat is available I eat it. When it isn't I don't. It is pretty simple.

I already pointed out I do not eat meat if it is impure in any of three ways.

When practitioners consume meat with a method, then there is benefit.

Namdrol said:

Dzogchen theoretically rejects the distinction between sentient and non-sentient.

Really? So rocks also have Buddha nature according to Dzogchen and are capable of attaining awareness of their true nature?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is made out of rigpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nemo said:

Look at the price tag of your organic food next time you are at the store. Are you going to tell me land is more productive specifically in calories per acre using organic practices?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it is.

Nemo said:
Then wouldn't everyone do it?

Malcolm wrote:
It's a rigged game, with a long history that goes back to the 18th century. Fundamentally, the land use patterns of Southern planters became dominant in the wheat and corn growing regions of the US, and the Northern practices of restorative husbandry fell by the wayside.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 7:31 PM
Title: Re: Combining Semde and Bimala
Content:

AlexanderS said:
If used on the same day, should Bimala be taken in the evening if Semde is taken in the morning?

Is it also okay to take 1 pill of agar-35 when taken Bimala?

Malcolm wrote:
No need to take Agar 25 with Vimala -- take either one or the other.

You can take Semde in the morning with either of these.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 10:42 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen and the concept of progress....
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Dzogchen is unique because...

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhahood is an innate quality:

“Oh Vajradhara you must listen! Since buddhahood is unconditioned, there is no buddhahood through fabricated dharmas. The three kāyas of buddhahood are present as the kāya of prajñā. Since there are no material signs in the the kāya of prajñā, it is unaffected by the consequences of karma. Since this impure deluded appearance arises as buddhahood, there is no need to purify karma and traces.”
-- The Tantra of Buddhahood as an Intrinsic Attribute

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Some may argue that plants aren't sentient beings but there's been discoveries regarding plant behavior which refute that view.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen theoretically rejects the distinction between sentient and non-sentient.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

practitioner said:

So if I have a house infested with termites and I hire an exterminator to spray the whole place, since I didn't do the actual killing myself I have no karmic responsibility? Sure...

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you are, you are contracting it to be done, just as if you contracted a butcher to slaughter a steer for you.

Your objection is moot however since I was not making this argument.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: How to learn from a Teacher of the Dharma <?>

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Second make sure you avoid the many Buddhist cults out there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nemo said:

The health benefits for either camp are simply not there.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonesense, industrial agriculture contributes significantly to global warming or climate instability, whatever you want to call it. It results in large scale enviromental degradation, it is hugely inefficient, costly, and it returns less and less every year in terms of energy inputs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nemo said:

Maybe on planet granola. Pests eat so much you need to plant at least twice as much and the labour involved is often ridiculous.

As well the produce rots much faster and in the "good ol' days" of organic farming it took one in six adults working full time growing food to produce enough to feed everyone.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you don't know very much about organic farming, companion planting etc. But believe whatever you want. People have different definitions of food. Mine excludes anything grown through agrocporate methods, GMOS, etc.

If organic produce really rots faster (it doesn't), I would take that as a good sign.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Are you actually claiming that if you go to one of those Chinese seafood restaurants where they have the live fish in tanks, and you point to the fish you want them to kill and cook, it is karmically and morally different from going to a restaurant and letting them choose which fish to kill and cook to feed you?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't eat seafood in those kind of Chinese resturants; I don't order lobster in places where they boil them to order. I don't eat meat that I have seen being killed. And I never ask anyone to slaughter animals on my behalf. I won't eat meat that has been slaughtered for me.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

But frankly, being a vegetarian is not a superior moral choice. If you are a vegetarian for reasons of health it is one thing. But vegetarianism as moral campaign is deluded. Millions of animals large and small die to bring vegetables and grains to our plates every day. But over and over again vegetarians justify this claiming that the purpose of such agriculture is not to kill animals, so therefore, they morally excuse themselves from culpability in the death of countless millions of creatures.

Acchantika said:

It seems to me that your argument is against the modern agriculture industry not vegetarianism per se. If vegetarianism could operate without the use of organic or inorganic pesticides in a sustainable way perhaps that would be the superior moral choice. This isn't feasible on a large scale currently, but vegetarianism even in its current state would be a progressive step towards that end while non-vegetarianism cannot be. In the same way that world peace is not achievable currently, and many may technically die because one does not join an army to protect oppressed countries by killing oppressors, this is not a valid reason to join the army.

Malcolm wrote:

When people stop killing animals for food, I will stop eating meat. Until then, I won't. It is pretty simple. I personally don't care what diet people have -- but the saccharine fake compassion holier than thou attitude of some vegetarians is pretty pathetic. So if your conscience won't permit you to eat meat, great, don't eat it. My conscience won't permit me not to. But don't lecture me with some lame ass criticisms and poorly cited arguments from Abhidharma (which incidentally is a Hinayāna system in which meat eating is permitted). If people wish to follow common Mahāyāna and avoid meat, fine. The Hevajra tantra states however "Those who eat meat have compassion."

If you really want to follow the common Mahāyāna POV, not only must you avoid meat, but you must avoid onion, garlic, scallions, wine, and so on. So if you are going to do down that road, be consistent. Don't eat onion, garlic, meat, drink wine and so on.

As I pointed out, if people grass fed their cattle in a proper way, for both dairy and meat, we could reverse 200 years of carbon release in ten-twenty years.

So far no one has answered my observation that whether eats meat or not makes absolutely not one whit of difference concerning whether one will become an awakened person or not. But there are apparently some people think that their choice diet makes them superior buddhists -- well, screw that, what bullshit -- load of religious crapola disconnected with reality.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Nemo said:

I don't know if that is still true. Organic agriculture would only produce enough food for about 3 billion people right now with current land usage. If that is the "moral" choice,.....

Malcolm wrote:

That is also not true. The only reason we have industrial agriculture is because of oil.

There are much smarter ways to do agriculture. Small organic farms generate a much higher yield per acre than large agrobusiness monocrop "farms".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

according to the Buddhist view of karma, accidentally stepping on a bug is different from deliberately stepping on a bug. What is the difference? In the first case there is no intention to kill, in the second there is. In eating a carrot, there is no intention to kill; in eating a hamburger, by definition, there is.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, that just not fly. Buying a hamburger in a market does not equate intention to kill. I know you desperately want it too, but it does not. Asking someone outright to slaughter a steer so you can have meat on the other hand would involve an intention to kill.

Bhavaviveka dispensed with your argument long ago in his Tarkajyala.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 11th, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if you purchase meat, either in a store or restaurant, you are, in effect, paying someone to kill the animal for you, so the intent is there just as much as if you killed the animal yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

By the same reasoning, if you eat a tomato, etc. to which pesticides have been applied, you are as culpable in terms of intent as the farmer in the death of the insects. But of course ideological vegetarians always try to excuse the harm to beings caused by agriculture. It is one of their largest blind spots.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Chatral Rinpoche is a dzogchen master and is a big advocate of vegetarianism...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct. He is setting a good example for those who do not have the capacity to employ methods.

As for me, I follow Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's advice.

But frankly, being a vegetarian is not a superior moral choice. If you are a vegetarian for reasons of health it is one thing. But vegetarianism as moral campaign is deluded. Millions of animals large and small die to bring vegetables and grains to our plates every day. But over and over again vegetarians justify this claiming that the purpose of such agriculture is not to kill animals, so therefore, they morally excuse themselves from culpability in the death of countless millions of creatures.

We all live in a world where our decisions negatively impact the lives of other creatures all the time. We drive a car for 20 minutes, how many bugs are smashed on our windshields? I see a serious myopia on the part of vegetarians who excuse themselves from the harm they cause insects and mammals through driving, who excuse themselves from the environmental degradation caused by their use of oil, who excuse themselves from their contributions to the effluent stream much of which is simply dumped into the ocean, and who then excoriate in a high handed fashion people who meat.

Frankly, eating grassfed meat is far better for the environment and ecosystems in the

world than being a consumer of soy products. Soy is a very environmentally damaging crop (<http://civileats.com/2009/01/27/a-vegan-reassesses-soy-a-health-and-environmental-perspective> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"). Grass fed cattle who are moved from fresh pasture to pasture actually sequester carbon and rebuild the local environment because of the interaction between cattle and pasture. Joel Salatin writes in his recent *The Sheer Ecstasy of Being a Lunatic Farmer* (2010, Polyface):

There you have it: mob stocking herbivorous solar conversion lignified carbon sequestration fertilization. If every farmer in America practiced this prehistoric system, in fewer than ten years we would sequester all the carbon that has been emitted since the beginning of the industrial age. It's really that simple. One of the most environmentally-enhancing things you can do is to eat grass finished beef. That sequesters more carbon than soybeans, or corn, or any other annual. And yet how many radical environmentalists have turned to soy milk and veganism in order to be earth friendly. (page 28)

Finally, in the end, being an eater of meat does not make one less capable of realizing the meaning of the teachings, and being a vegetarian does not make one more capable of realizing the teachings.

That is the bottom line.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

practitioner said:

My point being, Milarepa was a Buddha, capable of extraordinary feats due to his complete realization of emptiness. So the fact that Milarepa or Marpa or any other highly realized practitioner ate meat is of no concern to me because they of course realized the true emptiness of that action.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, Milarepa ate meat as a matter of course in his life, both before and after his awakening.

practitioner said:

How many people who eat meat claiming to do it with a Dzogchen/Vajrayana view of eating the meat of sentient beings out of compassion really have the realization to actually do it? How many are just using the terms Dzogchen and Vajrayana to justify their own attachments to eating meat?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not require "realization", it merely requires a method, mindfulness and compassion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Channeled Message from the Buddha

Content:

Aemilius said:

If we accept tertons and teachings based on pure visions, why not the channeled teachings ?

<http://organiccocosmos.ning.com/profiles/blogs/channeled-message-from-buddha-through-elizabeth-trutwin>

According to Buddha (in Kalama sutta and elsewhere) we should not depend on authority, but we should depend on our own reason, our own capability of judgement. In practice buddhism seems to be only about authority, if lama so and so says something then it has to be accepted by everyone, we must be good boys and girls.

Malcolm wrote:

"You cling to the programming from inside the Matrix."

Seriously?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 11:27 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Namdrol said:

The Vajrayāna/Dzogchen perspective is that refusing to eat meat is a refusal to extend one's compassion. So one must decide what level one is going to practice at.

N

practitioner said:

Well there is no ONE Vajrayana perspective either. For example, I am from the Kagyu tradition and the Karmapa has given up meat and is now vegetarian. Does he not practice Vajrayana?? Here is a short excerpt from a transcript of a teaching on the subject.

Malcolm wrote:

He is setting a good example for those who prefer a more Mahāyāna approach to this issue. But I don't consider his point of view a Vajrayāna approach. It is a lower tantra/common Mahāyāna perspective.

You will also recall that Milarepa was a meat eater, as was Marpa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

practitioner said:

However, I think the most important point is that eating meat should be unacceptable from a Buddhist perspective and whatever it takes for anyone to reach that conclusion is fine by me.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many Buddhist perspectives, and often they stand in apparent contradiction to one another.

The common Mahāyāna perspective is that eating meat is unacceptable.

The Vajrayāna/Dzogchen perspective is that refusing to eat meat is a refusal to extend one's compassion. So one must decide what level one is going to practice at.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 6:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

I don't deny evolution. However I also do not believe that modern humans evolved from hominids that evolved from apes...

Anyway, if you didn't attend the retreat I mentioned where Rinpoche talked about some of this, the replay should be available as you know.

Malcolm wrote:

Apes also evolved from hominids. We are all cousins. This is just a genetic fact.

I heard what Rinpoche said. He does not believe in Meru. Ok. Cool. He does not believe in the evolution of humans from apes. Ok. Cool (anthropologists don't either). He prefers the Treta Yuga etc., model. Ok cool -- but that has nothing to do with the

mathematical precision with which we can track DNA, etc., and nothing to do with the fact that our human form evolved from earlier and less sophisticated forms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

So I agree with Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche that the idea of humans "evolving from apes" is rather silly.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, actually Humans evolved from earlier homonids. Apes evolved along different lines than humans, branching off from the hominidea clade. No one who studies paleo-anthropology would say that humans evolved from apes.

The physical form we call "homo sapiens" at present is 100% a product of evolution.

Evolution is not merely a theory, it is a demonstrable fact that can be empirically reproduced in labs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 10th, 2012 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

At issue is not where the IE languages developed, but the timeframe and the mechanism of its diffusion. The Aryan invasion theory as you are aware posits a light-skinned conquering tribe of nomadic "Aryas" on chariots that conquered a dark-skinned Dravidian city-dwelling culture bringing with them the Vedic culture. This theory is proto-fascist hogwash based on a fanciful reading of itihasa.

There is no evidence that the Vedic culture originated anywhere other than India. This is not to say that Vedic culture is the source of the IE language family. Conquest is much less effective than commerce to spread a language. English is a perfect example of that.

Malcolm wrote:

George Dumezil shows there is clear continuity between, for example Roman ritual practices conducted by flamens and Indian ritualism conducted by brahmins, and as we all know, br becomes fl by phonetic shift.

No one has suggested by the way that the Rg Veda was composed outside of India since

places in NW India can be clearly discerned with it. What has been suggested is that it was composed by peoples who had newly arrived in India, that the language of the text bears evidence of this fact, and that the culture that produced the Rg Veda bear a culture continuity with steppe nomads.

If by Vedic culture you mean the post Harappan civilization that emerged in India, then we can agree. But if you are proposing the Sarasvati culture meme of the Hindutvavadins, well, they have little evidence for this. It is all very speculative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You should read Bryant's book. His basic pov it is that there is little in the way of solid proof for either side of this debate.

Another book you ought to read:

The Horse, The Wheel and Language by David W. Anthony, Princeton, 2007

In partcular you should read the section from 402-411. This entire book adequately supports the claim that PIE evolved in the steppes of Asia among nomads.

The basic point is that language carries culture, not DNA.

So there is plenty of evidence for the fact that Proto IE languge speakers moved into India from outside of it: dna, linguistics, archaeology, etc. These days these kinds of movements can be plotted mathematically on the basis of both linguistics and dna, just as the spread of human language can be plotted mathematically from South Africa to Polynesia. Both phonemic and genetic diversity is densest in South Africa, and least dense in among Polynesians.

Sure, the first people to move into India probably moved there 75,000 years ago. There have been many successive movements of people into India. Humans beings come from Africa, not India.

Witzel owned Frawley because Witzel's Sanskrit is much better than Frawley's and Witzel is a better scholar.

Karma Dorje said:

Witzel has staked his reputation on defending a theory that there is no objective evidence for.

The same charge may be leveled at Hindutvavada. Read Bryant.

He has politicized the conversation to a large degree...

So have the Hindutvavadins.

The most damning evidence to the theory, aside from the complete lack of an archeological record which substantiates their fanciful interpretation of veda and itihasa is current genetic analysis that demonstrates that the population of India has been indigenous for at least the last 10,000 years.

This does not prevent IE languages coming from some location in central Asia.

Languages, as well as pots, are not people. English proves that well enough.

Whilst at McGill in the 90s, I had constant arguments with Katherine Young and others about this theory which they have all now rejected in light of current scientific evidence. When philology and fact collide, facts usually win.

Malcolm wrote:

It is highly unlikely that the IE languages and cultures evolved in India and spread from there. The Hindutva theory is every bit as racist as the Hindutvavadins claim the Aryan Invasion Theory to be.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

The last thing I want to do is argue about brand marketing with a true believer.

Malcolm wrote:

The only thing I believe in is my own personal experience. Claims of realization are bullshit. Realization is bullshit.

That being said, the idea that the goals of this or that Hindu system and this or that Buddhist system are the same is pretty far fetched, as far as I am concerned.

For example, Jivanmuktis are held to be able to remove the karma of others. This is a preposterous claim from a Buddhist perspective.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I guess you consider yourself a great master. It must be so since you are arguing from experience.

How terribly patronizing. The experience I argue from is my interaction with masters,

particularly my tsawai lama that held lineages from both traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Who says your mulaguru actually knows shit? Everyone has a a root guru. Very few of them are realized. And even if you claim he/she is realized, who can vouch for your claim? Proclamations of the realization of one's master is pretty much a shell game.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

The question I would ask in light of this, is how do the Mahavidya, Nath, and Kaula traditions relate to the Dravidians? Who here thinks (or knows) that the "'Indo-Aryan" invasion of Dravidian India' theory (that the Mahabharata is said to describe) holds any weight?

The so-called Aryan invasion theory has been thoroughly debunked in modern academia.

Malcolm wrote:

No it hasn't. Havn't you read Witzel's debunking of the Hindutva nationalist origins theory? Especially Frawley's tepid presentation?

The best and most balanced book on the subject is The Quest for The Origins of Vedic Culture by Edwin Bryant, Oxford, 2001.

Karma Dorje said:

While there are a number of full length works, this article provides a decent synopsis of the main arguments against it:

http://www.hindunet.org/hindu_history/ancient/aryan/aryan_frawley.html "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

You can read Frawley getting owned by Michael Witzel back in 2002 in a number of exchanges involving the two of them as well as others. In order to access these articles you need to go here:

<http://www.hindu.com/thehindu/op/arcop.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

And access them by date.

1/22/02 N.S. Rajaram : Historical divide: archaeology and literature

1/29/02 M. Witzel Indus Civilisation and Vedic society

2/5/02 Clarence Maloney : Vedic-Indus debate: save Indian civilisation today

2/19/02 N.S. Rajaram: Theory and evidence

3/5/02 M. Witzel : Harappan horse myths and the sciences

3/12/02 R. Nagaswamy: Harappan horse

5/21/02 M. Witzel (assisted by Richard Meadow): Horses, logic, and evidence

6/18/02 David Frawley: Vedic literature and the Gulf of Cambay discovery

6/25./02 M. Witzel : A maritime Rigveda? — How not to read ancient texts

7/2/02 R. Nagaswamy : From Harappan horse to camel

7/9/02 Patrizia Norelli-Bachelet : Cosmology in Rigveda — the third premise

7/16/02 D.,Frawley: Witzel's vanishing ocean

8/6/02 M. Witzel Philology vanished: Frawley's Rigveda — I

8/13/02 M. Witzel: Philology vanished: Frawley's Rigveda — II

8/20/02 D.Frawley: Witzel's philology

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

I think that there is a larger point that bears greater investigation: regardless of stated viewpoint, is the actual realization of the great masters of these various teachings different? My experience of this is that it is not. .

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you consider yourself a great master. It must be so since you are arguing from experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Nighthawk said:

What is Lakshmi seen as?

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhism, Laxmi is called Vasudevi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Nemo said:

So when a certain mantra is done in the context of Hindu Japa it is mundane, but if I do it Buddhist style it becomes supermundane. Same mantra but different being. Sounds unlikely.

Namdrol said:

Tara mantra is just about the only mantra I know of that is shared between both traditions. But the mahavidyā tradition in Hinduism is quite different in its approach to Tara practice than Tara practice as it exists in Buddhism. Here is a clear example of a popular Buddhist deity being appropriated by Hinduism.

This is the point of the view of the Mahavidyā tradition:

"Tantra is accepted as the authoritative proof then and then only when it contradicts not the Vedas. Whatever goes clearly against the Vedas can in no way be accepted as a proof. In matters concerning Dharma, the Vedas is the Sole Proof."

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/db/bk11ch01.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Buddhists do not accept śruti i.e. Vedic authority.

N

Nemo said:

Tara is a bad example. IMO I think they are different. But there are many more mantras in common.

Malcolm wrote:

well, the mantra of both Taras is the same i.e. om tare tuttare ture svaha.

Nemo said:

Lets take Jambala. A minor Hindu deity and Buddhist Protector. He was a student of the Buddha of the previous age. If memory serves Kashyapa Buddha. He took vows and has been a full time Bodhisattva long before recorded history.

Malcolm wrote:

Jambhala is not a Hindu deity.

Nemo said:

Perhaps parts of Hinduism are remnants of teachings of Buddhas of past ages. To say there was no Dharma prior to the historical Buddha in 500 BC and that only humans have access to Dharma seems doctrinaire.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say any of this.

Nemo said:

Many of the Gods were taught by the historical Buddha and received prophecies on their eventual Buddhahood. Some were also taught by previous Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Receiving a prediction does not make you awakened.

Nemo said:

Will Jambala not bless Hindu devotees?

Malcolm wrote:

They don't practice Jambhala. They practice Kubera. Same type of deity, to be sure. But not identical.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Well I've heard something along the lines of that the Upanishads were originally composed by Dravidian Tantrikas, and then later on the Vedics tacked them onto the Vedas thereby trying to claim the Upanishads as their own.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, the Upanishads themselves refer to the Vedas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Emanations in Indian Religions

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Isn't it quite possible, even likely, that the Mahavidya/Tantric Mother-Goddess tradition is originally pre-Vedic Dravidian?

Malcolm wrote:

The Mahāvidyā tradition is Puranic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Nemo said:

So when a certain mantra is done in the context of Hindu Japa it is mundane, but if I do it Buddhist style it becomes supermundane. Same mantra but different being. Sounds unlikely.

Malcolm wrote:

Tara mantra is just about the only mantra I know of that is shared between both traditions. But the mahavidyā tradition in Hinduism is quite different in its approach to Tara practice than Tara practice as it exists in Buddhism. Here is a clear example of a popular Buddhist deity being appropriated by Hinduism.

This is the point of the view of the Mahavidyā tradition:

"Tantra is accepted as the authoritative proof then and then only when it contradicts not the Vedas. Whatever goes clearly against the Vedas can in no way be accepted as a proof. In matters concerning Dharma, the Vedas is the Sole Proof."

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/db/bk11ch01.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Buddhists do not accept śruti i.e. Vedic authority.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Namdrol said:

The verity of the claim "Kali is Yogini" is what is underdispute. However, for my part, if the tradition maintains that Kali is the subordinate of Yogini, that they are different person, one indicated by the name "Kali" and the other indicated by the name "Yogini", then I accept that they are different.

Adamantine said:

I thought it was regarding Troma and Kali, not Vajrayogini and Kali.

Malcolm wrote:

Troma is a form of Yogini.

Adamantine said:

You did belittle the tendency to conflate all female divinities into one "mother" in both the Hindu and Buddhist tradition...

Malcolm wrote:

No I didn't.

Adamantine said:

Similarly, this trinity is also referred to as "the three Mothers". So they are seen as distinct. But if you were to conflate them into one, I believe it would be Samantabhadri, not Vajrayogini.

Malcolm wrote:

Besides the point.

Adamantine said:

Maybe, but was their practice or realization any different? One of the most common teaching stories circulated by modern Tibetan Lamas is the good old "dog's tooth".

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of bullshit gets swept under that rug.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:
threats of banning.

Malcolm wrote:

Not by me. But by all means, continue with your obsession about delusion, picking the right one as it were.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Has a genuine and impartial evaluation of Trika and Dzogchen been made in the last couple hundred years? No, because on both side there is more importance given to the brand than an honest discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Trika is realist. Dzogchen is not.

Namdrol said:

Once again, if you read the Karandavyuha, you will find Shiva is converted by Avalokiteshvara. Two different persons, if you will.

And if you read the Abhidharma there is a square central mountain with the continents arrayed around it. It doesn't take a brilliant polemicist to come up with stories like that and it convinces no one who hasn't already made up their mind.

Malcolm wrote:

The persons who authored the Karandavyuha clearly intended different persons by the name "Shiva" and "Avalokiteshvara".

Namdrol said:

I already accepted intertextuality.

I am not positing intertextuality. I am positing shared genesis and continued cross-fertilization.

Malcolm wrote:
Same difference.

Namdrol said:

I can't see how you can dismiss the cosmology of the central mountain on the one hand and yet still insist on cosmological fables of the creation of the devatas when there is a clearly symbolic agenda to the use of these deities as seats.

I was arguing from the point of view of the tradition itself. I was not making a truth claim. The position of the tradition itself is not in dispute. The verity of its claims is.

Malcolm wrote:

The verity of the claim "Kali is Yogini" is what is underdispute. However, for my part, if the tradition maintains that Kali is the subordinate of Yogini, that they are different person, one indicated by the name "Kali" and the other indicated by the name "Yogini", then I accept that they are different.

For example, Tibetans imagined that Bodhgaya was in Assam for centuries. They went in pilgrimages their, made offerings at Hindu shrines they imagined were Buddhists ones, and so on. But certainly, these gods the Tibetans mistook for Buddhist deities were not.

Namdrol said:

No, the mythos is history. It shows the means of Buddhist appropriations of an older religious culture and a repurposing of it to suit Buddhist purposes. The Buddhist stupa's parts is a reworking of the symbolism of the vedic fire altar. But certainly a Buddhist stupa is not a vedic fire altar.

No one would argue that a stupa is a fire altar, nor a kila a yupa. However, when one looks impartially at tantric ritual in both Hindu and Buddhist context they see that both draw in exactly the same manner upon the Vedic strata.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, this is the ritual syntax of Pan-Indian culture.

Namdrol said:

Tantrism accomplished the same thing in ostensibly different contexts and traditions that likely developed at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with you. It is my opinion that different traditions adopted the body based methods of tantrism that grew out of the Upanishadic/Yoga/Ayurvedic traditions and adapted them to their own view and soteriologies. I do not accept as a necessary consequence that these methods offer the same result irrespective of the views of those who practice them.

I prefer Trika to all other versions of Hinduism, but I do not think that Trika and Dzogchen are even remotely the same. I am pretty certain there is no Togal in Trika -- at least, in what I have read in English (a fair amount) I have never run across it. Of course, I do

recognize that texts like the Vijñānabhairava have many methods that bear resemblance to certain preliminary Dzogchen practices. Emptiness is not the final view in Trika, however. It is the final view in Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Nemo said:

I don't mix practices of course. But I am not so closed minded as to think that the Rahula that the Hindus worship is different from the one Buddhists do.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two, in fact, the mundane one, and the supermundane one used to control the latter.

This is all getting rather far afield.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 9th, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

There are two points here: the first that you seem to be saying that the only way to realization is through practicing Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

I do not believe the ideas about liberation in non-buddhist traditions and Buddhist traditions are commensurate. They are different ideas of liberation which offer different kinds of results.

Karma Dorje said:

The second point is that I am not making an equation between Chakrasamvara and Shiva. I have not looked at the historical record of these traditions. The equation between Pashupati and Avalokiteshvara on the one hand and Chinnamasta and Vajrayogini are well documented as two prominent examples of shared provenance.

Malcolm wrote:

Once again, if you read the Karandavyuha, you will find Shiva is converted by Avalokiteshvara. Two different persons, if you will.

Karma Dorje said:

Not to mention the use of pancamakaras in both Kaula and Vajrayana ritual, the identity of the upacharas used in worship, or shared lineage gurus amongst the 84 mahasiddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

I already accepted intertextuality.

Karma Dorje said:

I can't see how you can dismiss the cosmology of the central mountain on the one hand and yet still insist on cosmological fables of the creation of the devatas when there is a clearly symbolic agenda to the use of these deities as seats.

Malcolm wrote:

I was arguing from the point of view of the tradition itself. I was not making a truth claim.

Karma Dorje said:

Śrī Devi is almost certainly not of Indian origin. In fact what relationship there is between Śrī Devi is a relationship with Nīla-sarasvatī.

As I am sure you are aware, there is close equation in Hindu tantra between Tara/Nīlasarasvatī and Kālī, particularly at Tārāpitha. It is in fact likely that Tara's cult came to Bengal from Tibet, as indicated by her name "Mahācinnatara". Tantra cross-pollinated at many points over the last couple millennia.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a tendency on the Hindu side to boil every female manifestation down into a great mother. Likewise, there is tendency on the Buddhist side to boil all female manifestations down into a great mother. But I don't think one is accurate in portraying Prajñāpāramitā as Kālī.

Karma Dorje said:

However, reading the mythos as history rather than polemics is nonsensical.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the mythos is history. It shows the means of Buddhist appropriations of an older religious culture and a repurposing of it to suit Buddhist purposes. The Buddhist stupa's parts is a reworking of the symbolism of the vedic fire altar. But certainly a Buddhist stupa is not a vedic fire altar.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

But to say a mundane God...

Isn't this rather like the Christians that insist that only those that believe in Jesus will be saved?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not.

Karma Dorje said:

Who is to say that all beings who aren't nominally Buddhist are samsaric?

Malcolm wrote:

All beings who are not āryas are samsaric.

Karma Dorje said:

While I will agree that if we are to make correspondences between Hindu and Buddhist forms of the goddess the correlation is between Vajrayogini and Chinnamasta, there certainly is little conceptual OR energetic difference between the Hindu Mahakali and any of a constellation of Mahakalis in the Buddhist pantheon.

Malcolm wrote:

Śrī Devi is almost certainly not of Indian origin. In fact what relationship there is between Śrī Devi is a relationship with Nīla-sarasvatī.

Karma Dorje said:

The use of various devatas as a seat is merely the age-old religious principle of "the god of the old religion becomes the devil of the new" that we see around the world...

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that Yogini is not Kali. Yogini forcefully appropriates the garb of Kali just as Heruka forcefully appropriates the garb of Bhairava and in the process "liberates" them, bestowing a prediction of Bhairava's eventual buddhahood. But this by no means can be taken to mean that Shiva is Cakrasamvara or Kali is Yogini, even given the fact of intertextuality between Indian traditions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Four mantras

Content:

rai said:

dear whoever seen the book and/or have the knowledge,

so finally i got the book and have one question, there are mantras to recite and to write on

the scarf or tshirt but what we are suppose to do with the Chakras? hang it on the wall or wore as an amulets?

thank you!

Malcolm wrote:
Amulet.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 9:25 AM
Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
All of this argument about relative truth is merely trying to choose one delusion over another.

Waste of time.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 6:35 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:
Bhusuku said:
Well, after a while of searching I came across
https://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=ru&ie=UTF8&langpair=ru%7Cen&rurl=www.google.com&twu=1&u=http://rangjungyeshe.ru/page.php%3Fid%3D472&usg=ALkJrhg57Ztx9vWVOwrDxHC-RQwXRcbIjQ. But now's the question: is this the "right" version, i.e. are there different ways to sing the kun bzang smon lam?

Malcolm wrote:
Mostly it is sung according to the whim of the Umdze of a given monastery.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Chanting
Content:

conebeckham said:
I think it's a combination of a lot of things.....melodies and means of chanting sometimes came to great masters in "visions," etc.

There's a funny song, I think it was from Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo, about the differences between lineages--and he talks about the differences in chanting styles--

"Gandenpas chant from deep below, Nyingmas chant through the nose, " or some sort of funny comments like that. He also pokes fun of every lineage, before really making some terse statements about the great benefit of all....

There are quite elaborate systems of music, melody, chanting, etc., for every lineage--even for sub-lineages. I'm sure even the various Nyingma lineages have quite a variety of styles, melodies, etc.

A few years back I was very fortunate to have two Bhutanese (Drukpa Kagyu) Loppons stay with me for a while, and we did a shrine consecration--I joined them, and their methods of chanting, melodies, music, etc. was utterly unlike what I'd been taught. The varieties are truly endless!

Blue Garuda said:
Ah, thanks.

At the moment, when unfamiliar, I just rise and fall with the tide of actions by those who know what they are doing! LOL

Malcolm wrote:
The most profound Dzogchen chant is Song of the Vajra.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 1:57 AM
Title: Re: What are the differences between reincarnation and rebirth?
Content:
Will said:
Incarnation: (esp. of a deity or spirit) embodied in flesh; in human form
says a dictionary.

Something is distinct from the flesh and thus is within the body. Since the 4 higher skandhas qualify as distinct from the rupa-form, the only question is - are they 'within' the body or not. If yes, then reincarnation is more accurate; if no, then rebirth is more accurate.

Malcolm wrote:
OED:

rebirth |rē' bərTH, 'rē, bərTH|

noun

the process of being reincarnated or born again: the endless cycle of birth, death, and rebirth.

- the action of reappearing or starting to flourish or increase after a decline; revival: the rebirth of a defeated nation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: What are the differences between reincarnation and rebirth?

Content:

Nighthawk said:

There is no "soul" that transmigrates from one body to the other so how is it possible to say both versions are identical?

Namdrol said:

There is nothing in the word "reincarnation" that suggests a soul; there is nothing in the word "rebirth" that does not.

N

Clarence said:

I once had a professor who was adamant that Buddhists should use rebirth. His argument was that reincarnation comes from the Latin *re in carne*, meaning again into the flesh. So, he took that to mean there was one entity going into a body again instead of, well, the Buddhist idea. To me, although his argument makes sense, I think it is too pedantic and don't care.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, by his argument reincarnation is better, since what happens rebirth is the reappropriation of a body, hence reincarnation. Also what gets reborn? Why a body, of course.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Chanting

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

I know next to nothing about Dzogchen and indeed the Nyingma in general.

My background is Gelugpa where the chanting I have encountered has been fairly flat or the deep throat chanting I can almost accomplish at times.

I have recently posted about receiving an empowerment from Dozgchen Rinpoche, in the course of which I received a mantra and also bought a CD of Dzogchen Monastery Chants.

I find the chants completely engrossing as they enter my mind, almost hypnotic, and chanting the one for which I have transmission is a wonderful experience.

The complexity of the Dzogchen chants seems to involve a lot of singing 'around' each syllable rather than simple enunciation, and some variation such as 'OYM' at the start rather than 'OM' or 'AUMN'.

Is this a characteristic?

Is it was intended to disguise the mantra, or because it is rooted in a more ancient form, etc ?

Here's an example:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7YSlU1_kd-A "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:
It is just style.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 12:45 AM
Title: Re: Protectors in DC question
Content:

heart said:
Among others that is the Dharmapalas.

/magnus

dakini_boi said:
I thought the remains are offered to sentient beings of the 6 realms after the main offerings to the 3 roots and dharmapalas. - and therefore the dharmapalas are not included among the recipients of the remains.

Malcolm wrote:
They are not.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 12:44 AM
Title: Re: Protectors in DC question
Content:
Namdrol said:
They are offered to those outside the mandala.

dakini_boi said:
but why are they called "guardians?"

Malcolm wrote:
Becuase they also have some function of guarding place.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, May 8th, 2012 at 12:19 AM
Title: Re: Protectors in DC question
Content:

Namdrol said:
Just a remainder offering. Three roots are inside you, as well as protectors

dakini_boi said:
Why is the remainder offered to the "guardians of the remains." These are really offered to the guests of compassion, having nothing to do with dharmapalas - correct?

Malcolm wrote:
They are offered to those outside the mandala.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 9:47 PM
Title: Re: What are the differences between reincarnation and rebirth?
Content:

Nighthawk said:
There is no "soul" that transmigrates from one body to the other so how is it possible to say both versions are identical?

Malcolm wrote:
There is nothing in the word "reincarnation" that suggests a soul; there is nothing in the word "rebirth" that does not.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 11:21 AM
Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona
Content:
Nemo said:

Agreed.

Malcolm wrote:

Then there is nothing more to discuss.

When you invoke Kali, what you get is death. I have a tatoo of a Kali yantra on my left arm from my pre-Buddhist days. Kali is not Vajrayogini. Kali takes her payment in blood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 11:20 AM

Title: Re: What are the differences between reincarnation and rebirth?

Content:

Takoda said:

What is the difference between reincarnation and rebirth?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing at all. But some Buddhists like to pretend there is a difference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

This was answered by a high Lama, fyi.

Malcolm wrote:

So called "High" Lamas also assert Meru Cosmology is true. I don't put much value in the assertions of "high" lamas when they contradict common sense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 9:45 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Nemo said:

I think the only person qualified to answer that would be a high Lama who knows both parties personally. Many of these once mundane Gods have been practitioners and students of the Buddhas for aeons. If I kept my Samayas for a thousand years and used

the powers of a God to accumulate merit progress on the path would be swift. To think of Gods as static and unchanging sounds like eternalism. Even very negative beings become miraculous protectors full of love when they accept guidance of the Aryas.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, this is not the issue. Kali does not become Vajrayogini by mere fiat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 7th, 2012 at 8:33 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

Unless those traditional accounts had more to do with Buddhist-Hindu competing interpretations at the time of their inception. . . My understanding is that the actual energies of these two are identical, however, it is a misunderstanding of certain qualities and symbolism that have led Hindu devotees to do terrible things like commit blood human and animal sacrifices in her name, etc. Perhaps the symbolism of these early accounts has more to do with purifying the context of devotion from this degeneration, and is framed as suppression in a colorful way to communicate this. Again, I am just offering an alternative way to interpret what you are putting forth as an absolute truth. I am sure there are more.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a modern interpretation. Some Lama may have adopted it. I still think it is bunk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Interesting thread, about which I know very little.

Anyone care to comment on the TsurLuk and Pukluk systems, and their differences?

Malcolm wrote:

The main difference lies in when they start the year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Kilaya. said:

I usually add the Naggong to the Short Thun, I hope this little invention is not that bad.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not your invention. DC practices are quite modular.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

I don't see your logic here, what makes it impossible? You are talking about symbolic representations now, not the actual energies at play anymore.

Namdrol said:

It is simple. Yogini emanated to suppress Kāli, just as Heruka emanated to suppress Bhairava. Hence, there is no way Kali can be Yogini, there is no way this worldly goddess can be one and the same as Buddha Vajrayogini.

Adamantine said:

You believe this to be literally true Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

I believe that this is the traditional account of the origin of all forms of Vajrayogini and hence, it is impossible for Yogini to be Kali.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 9:57 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Jinzang said:

And, you should never be afraid to do guardian practice. They are guardians after all. They will never harm you.

I have been told that although the protectors are enlightened beings and would not harm practitioners, that they have oath bound beings in their retinue who are unenlightened and sometimes not very patient with lazy, careless, and conceited practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

More fear mongering.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Ah I see, thanks. So no matter how long or short a Ganapuja we perform (that is at least if Guardians are in any way involved), we should always transform regardless.

.

Malcolm wrote:

When you do with meal, there is no need to transform. In this case mainly you are making an offering to yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 6th, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

What is the best way to contact the Guardians without transforming...

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot. To contact guardians, one must always be in a transformation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

I don't see your logic here, what makes it impossible? You are talking about symbolic representations now, not the actual energies at play anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

It is simple. Yogini emanated to suppress Kāli, just as Heruka emanated to suppress Bhairava. Hence, there is no way Kali can be Yogini, there is no way this worldly goddess can be one and the same as Buddha Vajrayogini.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

That said, Krodakali, aka Troma, as practiced in the Nyingma lineage, is equivalent to Kali.

Namdrol said:

No it isn't. There is no relationship between the two. Krodhakali is a form of Vajrayogini. Vajrayogini is not Kali.

Adamantine said:

According to you. But not according to lineage masters I have conferred with. I have been told they are the same.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it ain't so.

Krodhakālī originally entered Tibet with Padampa Sangye, hence the long association with Chö. This transmission is from a sadhana Virupa received in Oḍḍiyāna from a dakini there.

Kālarātri aka Kālī along with Bhairāva serve as the seat of Cakrasamvara and Vajrayogini. So it is really quite impossible that Kālī can be Vajrayogini. In reality, Cakrasamvara and Vajrayogini emanated from Akaniṣṭha to counteract Bhairava and Kālī.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you are turning your meal into a Ganapuja there is no need for a separate plate, just make sure you leave some remainder.

dakini_boi said:

Is this remainder to be regarded as the 3-roots offering, or the offering of the remainders, or both?

Thank you, as usual, your input is invaluable in demystifying these things.

Malcolm wrote:

Just a remainder offering. Three roots are inside you, as well as protectors

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Thank you all.

Namdrol, this is what I figured, and you have set my mind at ease. Is this generally how guardian offerings are regarded in other Dzogchen-heavy Nyingma lineages?

Also, is it even necessary to have a separate plate for the 3 roots when doing (informal) tsog by oneself or in a small group?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are doing a Ganapuja then follow the instructions in the book for doing Ganapujas.

If you are turning your meal into a Ganapuja there is no need for a separate plate, just make sure you leave some remainder.

Most Nyingma lineages are into daily offerings and this sort of thing. AFAIK, ChNN is unique in his approach to guardians.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:20 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

You may be right. It could be illness or perhaps they were doing a practice like nyung nas which limits food and drink intake. If foul play is ruled out- it still leaves the question why were they in the cave in the first place? And why did those who supported them by providing food, water etc. for the three months they were there not have more sense. Why did they feel they could not inform the community? Something was not right. Did the assistants not recognise the danger the couple were in? It's all very murky and unpleasant.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps they contracted Hanta virus.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hantavirus> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

Namdrol said:

But the idea that guardians are jealous gods who might punish you because you don't

feed them everyday is a very primitive concept. Therefore, in the DC we do not worry about it so much.

N

Dronma said:

Yes, exactly!

Nevertheless, it is not good (like Rinpoche says) to correct practitioners from other lineages. Each one has to follow the instructions which he/she got from his/her Guru.

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't correcting anyone, I was answering his question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Worldly Vehicle

Content:

dakini_boi said:

ChNNR made a passing statement about how Dzogchen includes all paths. I'm not sure I'm totally clear on what he said, but from what I understood, he said that in Dzogchen, the 1st 3 vehicles are:

1. all worldly vehicles, including non-buddhist spiritual paths
2. hinayana (I'm assuming this means both shrevakayana & pratyekabuddhayana)
3. mahayana

Could someone confirm or correct this?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to the sgra thal gyur, the first vehicle is called the vehicle of gods and men.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 6:59 AM

Title: Re: Protectors in DC question

Content:

dakini_boi said:

I'm wondering about protocols involving protectors in various lineages. A while ago, a kagyu friend told me that he is required to give a physical offering to the protectors every day - i.e. it's not a good idea to call on protectors without making an offering. Since then, I have been kind of hesitant to do any practice that calls on protectors, although I know the same rules don't apply in DC. What I'm wondering is - does this difference characterize general difference in how kagyu vs. nyingma deal with protectors? Or is it

an example of ChNNR's always going for the essence of the teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

You do not need to do protector offerings at all in the DC. Why? It is because the job of the protectors is to protect the transmission and the transmission lives in you. Therefore, they protect you. So you don't have to do anything.

Protectors do not eat tea and biscuits. They do not require fancy tormas.

Of course, sometimes it is useful to contact the guardians, for example, if you do something stupid which causes a problem in the transmission. Then you can purify this with guardian practice. Or if there is an obstacle to your practice, then you can make offerings to the guardians.

But the idea that guardians are jealous gods who might punish you because you don't feed them everyday is a very primitive concept. Therefore, in the DC we do not worry about it so much.

And, you should never be afraid to do guardian practice. They are guardians after all. They will never harm you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

In response to Namdrol's point that two explanations are not mutually exclusive, as I am not privy to the decisions of the Dharma Protectors I cannot say. However, I think in this case there are plenty of plain old rational explanations for what led to this sorry situation that any intervention by supernatural forces would be superfluous.

Malcolm wrote:

Gdon attacking retreatants and causing them to behave in bizarre ways is not unheard of. For example, Sachen Kunga Nyingpo was attacked by Gyalpo Pehar, for which he resorted to the meditation of Acala.

Likewise, Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje was assigned by Dudjom Rinpoche to do retreat in a cave where several people had died, presumably because there was a malevolent gdon that inhabited the place. His attendant was so freaked out, he left after only a few days.

Having myself done a solitary three year retreat, I can report that one's imagination can run away with itself. I can remember having a fantasy, among other fantasies, that a

chainsaw that my dad gave me to cut wood for myself suddenly started and chased me around the cabin. I had a similar fantasy about an axe.

These fantasies were very vivid. I of course understood they were merely fantasies, but they were powerful. I can remember brooding about what I would do in case of a nuclear emergency, and wondering which way I would go, west to find my parents, or east to find my best friend, etc.

Further, it is very easy for people in retreat to be subject of provocations of various kinds.

Despite the fact that we all generally are not super impressed with the Diamond Mountain scene (but then I am not super impressed with any of the missionary Buddhist organizations in the US, regardless of lineage or affiliation), the meltdown of Macnally and Thorson's retreat and ensuing tragedy should be met with compassion. Further, it must be very difficult for the other people in the retreat as well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Pero said:

So uhm, is there Kali in the Gelug tradition? Or in any other?

Knotty Veneer said:

You know I get kinda p*ssed off when people start implying supernatural causes in situations like this. Ooh it must be the dharma protectors taking revenge on samaya breakers. Oooh there must be rgyal po interfering with the retreat. Oooh the gnas gdon are hostile to the dharma and causing obstacles. And so on and so forth. The tragedy at Diamond Mountain was due to very human weaknesses. To suggest otherwise, absolves those involved of the blame due them and denies the victim the justice due him.

Malcolm wrote:

Both are possible without being mutually exclusive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 5th, 2012 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Adamantine said:

That said, Krodakali, aka Troma, as practiced in the Nyingma lineage, is equivalent to

Kali.

Malcolm wrote:

No it isn't. There is no relationship between the two. Krodhakali is a form of Vajrayogini. Vajrayogini is not Kali.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

heart said:

Funny thing, according to the local newspaper there was water and food in the cave. How do you die of dehydration when there is water?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It sounds like what he actually died of was exposure. Anyway, we will know soon when they release the autopsy report. Poor guy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is a lot of student codependence with dysfunctional gurus in general.

To be a true Guru, one must be more or less fully integrated.

To be a proper Dharma teacher, one must be 80% integrated.

gregkavarnos said:

What do you mean by "integrated"???

Malcolm wrote:

View and meditation integrated into conduct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

.... i mean, who could have foreseen this current tragic/farcical development?

Tilopa said:

Anyone who knows anything about Vajrayana Buddhism.

Something weird like this was bound to happen sooner or later.

Knotty Veneer said:

Well, aspiring yogis dying in caves was probably not unknown in Tibet either. While I think the people in and around Diamond Mountain should have taken heed long ago when the Dalai Lama censured Roach, they are probably not all crazies and dharmatose groupies. I imagine many are going thru a lot. Discovering your guru has feet of clay is not a pleasant experience.

But as gad rgyangs suggests it would probably better for them to cut their losses now and go elsewhere. As somebody else pointed out, Garchen Rinpoche - one of the finest yogis alive - lives in Arizona. Why would you waste your time with Roach (even if he were straight up) when Garchen Rinpoche is nearby?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot of student codependence with dysfunctional gurus in general.

To be a true Guru, one must be more or less fully integrated.

To be a proper Dharma teacher, one must be 80% integrated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Ku-nye

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Thanks for the usefull reply.

Another question:

- For what use are the 5 sticks in Tibetan Massage?
- Which places are hit regarding which indication ?

Mutsog marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

I am not familiar with that terminology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 4th, 2012 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Ku-nye

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Very simply, "ku" means to apply warm oil. Oil has the opposite qualities of lung; lung is sharp, cold, rough, light, motile; while oil is heavy, warm, dull, smooth, and stable.

The symptoms of many mental illnesses include wind symptoms.

The "nye" part means "to rub" -- so by rubbing, one can place the winds back in their proper place in the body.

If the wind becomes out of balance, it automatically disturbs the other humors. Therefore, at all times balancing wind is important.

kalden yungdrung said:

Among them, Massage (Ku-nye) is one of the very practical and effective methods to restore the energy and keep the humors in balance. Especially it is an effective method for rlung/wind disorder or psychological originated disorders.

Tashi delek,

Here a link regarding Ku-nye or Tibetan massage.

[http://www.tibetanmedicine-edu.org/index.php/tibetan-massage"](http://www.tibetanmedicine-edu.org/index.php/tibetan-massage)
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

A few questions:

- Especially it is an effective method for rlung/wind disorder or psychological originated disorders.

How can this be explained, the psychological aspect?

- How can which Tibetan system (energy) be effected by massage.?

- Is this done also with the help of pressure?

- How is the upward and downward energy influenced, in what case?

Thanks at before hand,

Mutsog Marro
KY

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 7:46 PM
Title: Re: Death at Tibetan Buddhist meditation retreat in Arizona
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Pretty sad situation.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 7:26 PM
Title: Re: Memorization of Dzogchen Tantras/Upadeshas/Texts
Content:
Fa Dao said:
Namdrol, you wouldnt happen to know of a good translation for that would you?

Malcolm wrote:
Well, it will probably be posted online when Rinpoche does the webcast in a few days times.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 11:43 AM
Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators
Content:

tomamundsen said:
Whoa!

So, will you ever get the chance to teach the Pramanavarttika as planned?

Malcolm wrote:
Not in the near future, no.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 10:01 AM
Title: Re: Modern Buddhist Utopias & Alternative Communities
Content:
Namdrol said:
If you put \$20,000 into a Thaibank, you can get a permanent resident visa if you are over fifty. You can easily live on your Social Security in Thailand.

kirtu said:

That's good to know but SS is a ways in the future and I now have < 20,000 anyway. Had I known that after I had to sell my condo then I might have done that.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I only found this out recently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Modern Buddhist Utopias & Alternative Communities

Content:

Nemo said:

Mansion sized house is about 35k out in the provinces.

kirtu said:

I have < 35k and it appears that I have been permanently locked out of the job market so what I have in the bank now is probably approximately what I have to survive on for many years.

Cambodia would be even cheaper. You could live like a king. Worth it for the occasional bout of Delhi belly.

The Cambodians killed each other off in my personal memory. One of my classmates was killed in the killing fields.

I can't go to Nepal or India as a long term solution because you have to leave the country for the year after 5-6 months because of the new visa restrictions.

The ideal thing in North America, if it is doable, is to create a Buddhist yogic community where people can creatively express themselves and create or collaborate So it's not s on their own projects while maintaining a place that they can do intense retreat if they like. So it's not secular as a focus but people can work as necessary and do retreat when they wish or need to. So not just secular and not just practice but a balance (although if people wanted to do life retreat then that should be possible too).

So in the immediate range, ideally I need to find a place for myself that I can then open up to others. I pitched this back on eSangha and I think here as: let's buy land and start a Dharmic civilization.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

If you put \$20,000 into a Thaibank, you can get a permanent resident visa if you are over

fifty. You can easily live on your Social Security in Thailand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: Memorization of Dzogchen Tantras/Upadeshas/Texts

Content:

Namdrol said:

Memorizing a short text like the aspiration of Samantabhadra is only helpful, never harmful.

kirtu said:

Does it plant a seed for future lives?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Most assuredly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Memorization of Dzogchen Tantras/Upadeshas/Texts

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I can see the benefit in doing this to help develop and clarify ones View/Tawa but I can also see the opposite. Would like to hear others thoughts on this...

Malcolm wrote:

Memorizing a short text like the aspiration of Samantabhadra is only helpful, never harmful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So the recognition is not discriminating? More like knowing the flavor of the base?

Namdrol said:

Recognition is prajñā.

Andrew108 said:

And this prajñā is the prajñā of self-liberation?

Malcolm wrote:

Self-liberation, as is clearly defined by the Dzogchen tantras is freedom from grasping. Whatever one grasps is not self-liberated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

So the recognition is not discriminating? More like knowing the flavor of the base?

Malcolm wrote:

Recognition is prajñā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

maybay said:

If I ever manage to integrate Dharma into my ego just do me a favour and shoot me.

Namdrol said:

Consider yourself shot.

maybay said:

I always thought of you as the goal-keeper. What should the fans think when they see him shooting goals with the forwards?

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, sports metaphors are lost on me, among many other things, like for example, what your point is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: value of personal experience

Content:

Namdrol said:

Visting teachers is not Dharma.

Receiving empowerments is not Dharma.

Dharma is understanding your real condition.

Clarence said:

However, when you visit teachers or receive empowerments, it is much easier to get an

understanding of your real condition. Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said don't receive transmission and teachings. I am saying, turn your dharma teachings and transmissions in Dharma. Use them to understand yourself. Don't leave them as an intellectual pursuit. For the most part, every dharma text I ever studied, am studying, and will study, was for the purpose of understanding something about my path, about myself, my own state. I learned Tibetan to enhance my practice, not to become a skilled translator who is expert in dancing on books (though I am pretty good). I did not learn Dharma to come to places like Dharma wheel and have debates. So I am pointing out that Buddhist Philosophy, the intellectual study of Buddhism divorced from a path, is a waste of time. If you want to study Madhyamaka, first understand how it is relevant to solving the Buddha's existential question: what is suffering, it's cause, it's cessation and the path. If you keep this in mind, then this study becomes Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: value of personal experience

Content:

Will said:

So when I wrote "vast numbers of sadhanas, initiations or Dharma talks heard" - they still provide "little or no education in Dharma"? Pretty grim picture - reading books suck, thinking sucks, listening to Dharma sucks, practice & wongs suck etc.

Namdrol said:

Reciting large stacks of sadhana is not Dharma.

Reading large volumes of sutras and shastras is not Dharma.

Visting teachers is not Dharma.

Receiving empowerments is not Dharma.

Taking vows and precepts is not Dharma.

This is all conceptual proliferation.

Dharma is understanding your real condition.

Will said:

My goodness - how simple - no need for conditionality, merit, purification, devotion or the conceptual mind - Dharma is Buddha.

Pithy sayings are the enemy of understanding like the perfect is the enemy of the better.

Malcolm wrote:

I am just echoing the words of Sakya Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen:

Freedom from extremes is beyond knowledge, expressions and objects;

Madhyamaka, Cittamatra, etc.,

expressions in words are proliferations.

Thoughts in the mind are concepts,

the nature is inexpressible and unthinkable.
For as long as views continue to exist,
there is no liberation from all suffering.
Conceptuality is great ignorance,
it is said one sinks into the ocean of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

If the basis could not be recognize, liberation would not be possible.

Or is it that liberation is possible because the base cannot be recognized?

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not how it is taught in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: value of personal experience

Content:

Will said:

So when I wrote "vast numbers of sadhanas, initiations or Dharma talks heard" - they still provide "little or no education in Dharma"? Pretty grim picture - reading books suck, thinking sucks, listening to Dharma sucks, practice & wongs suck etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Reciting large stacks of sadhana is not Dharma.

Reading large volumes of sutras and shastras is not Dharma.

Visting teachers is not Dharma.

Receiving empowerments is not Dharma.

Taking vows and precepts is not Dharma.

This is all conceptual proliferation.

Dharma is understanding your real condition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

Any effort in togal at all will gaurantee that one will attain buddhahood in the bardo.

N

alpha said:

isn't it more like if one dies while at the level of first vision one will be reborn in a pure realm where one will live for 500 years practising dzogchen ?

Malcolm wrote:

That will happen only if, for some reason, you were not able to recognise the appearances of the bardo of dharmatā as being your own state.

You ought to read Birth, Life and Death by ChNN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

In a real sense, however there is neither mind no matter. Mind and matter are equally produced through non-recognition of the basis i.e. essence, nature and energy.

N

Andrew108 said:

Is this saying that our 'reality' is the non-recognition of the basis? And if the basis is recognized then is this a recognition of another alternative 'reality'? When it comes to recognition of the base does it make sense to talk about it as being a 'reality' that can be known?

Malcolm wrote:

What our impure vision is a result of not recognizing the basis. When we fully recognize and then integrate with the basis, then our impure vision vanishes.

If the basis could not be recognize, liberation would not be possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

maybay said:

If I ever manage to integrate Dharma into my ego just do me a favour and shoot me.

Malcolm wrote:

Consider yourself shot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

deepbluehum said:

BTW, as fascinating and l33t as togal is, it's pretty difficult, as in super difficult. The postures are awkward. I think very few people will make to the final phase. Pranayama methods are a lot easier, and can be a lot more comfortable and easier on the eyes.

Namdrol said:

Any effort in togal at all will gaurantee that one will attain buddhahood in the bardo.

Can't say that about pranayāma.

N

deepbluehum said:

A good argument to do both.

Malcolm wrote:

Pranayāma is important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

deepbluehum said:

BTW, as fascinating and l33t as togal is, it's pretty difficult, as in super difficult. The postures are awkward. I think very few people will make to the final phase. Pranayama methods are a lot easier, and can be a lot more comfortable and easier on the eyes.

Malcolm wrote:

Any effort in togal at all will gaurantee that one will attain buddhahood in the bardo.

Can't say that about pranayāma.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 5:36 AM
Title: Re: value of personal experience
Content:

Will said:
Then why pick on intellectuals or readers...

Malcolm wrote:
Because while it is understandable that those with little or no education in Dharma might not have integrated Dharma into their life, it is inexcusable of those who are well educated.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 5:10 AM
Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...
Content:

deepbluehum said:
The relative truth, if you know it's just relative, and knows it's an illusion, then is not avidya anymore isn't it? [Unity of two truths to the rescue!]

Namdrol said:
This is the flaw of tregchö.

deepbluehum said:
Thregcho and togal are inseparable. I feel this notion of a flaw, no two truths and such comes from thinking thregcho is its own path and togal is something different.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, of course, in a real sense there is no tregchö without thogal and vice verse; but nevertheless, Longchenpa devotes many pages to criticizing tregchö in comparison with thögal.

The "no two truths" thing comes from my master, ChNN. But also in it is stated the same in the Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 4:28 AM
Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...
Content:

deepbluehum said:

The relative truth, if you know it's just relative, and knows it's an illusion, then is not avidya anymore isn't it? [Unity of two truths to the rescue!]

Malcolm wrote:

This is the flaw of tregchö.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Namdrol said:

<http://rsl-ne.com/abhidharma1.shtml>

dakini_boi said:

Hi Namdrol,

Could you provide the new link for this course? I know I asked you this once before, but I can't seem to find the post. Thanks again.

Malcolm wrote:

That website no longer exists and I no longer have any relationship with that organization or its teacher due to personal differences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I feel the middle way dispenses with dichotomies.

Namdrol said:

Yes, this is why the best thing we can say about the two truths is that they are neither truth nor are they false. Dichotomy resolved.

N

deepbluehum said:

To me this is the two truths as unity of the two truths, aka only one truth, and Dzogchen isn't that special.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, the sole truth in Dzogchen is not the unity of the two truths, because relative truth is only delusion, avidyā. There are no two truths in Dzogchen.

The sole truth in Dzogchen is vidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

But the first paragraph is quite interesting. I was under the impression that matter was a particular type, or case if you prefer, of mind and not the other way around.

Namdrol said:

In Abhidharma yes, matter comes from mind. In Dzogchen, no. Matter comes from the non-recognition of the five lights.

N

Dechen Norbu said:

And mind? The same , no?

Malcolm wrote:

The mind ultimately comes from the ignorance of non-recognition. The ignorance of non-recognition itself is predicated on a dispensable or relative latent awareness that exists at the time of the basis in the basis and is a function of the movement of vāyu or rlung in the basis, the movement that is responsible for the arising of the basis from the basis. When the display of the basis is recognized as being ones own display, that latent awareness becomes prajñā, when it does not, it becomes avidyā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

deepbluehum said:

I feel the middle way dispenses with dichotomies.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is why the best thing we can say about the two truths is that they are neither truth nor are they false. Dichotomy resolved.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

But the first paragraph is quite interesting. I was under the impression that matter was a particular type, or case if you prefer, of mind and not the other way around.

Malcolm wrote:

In Abhidharma yes, matter comes from mind. In Dzogchen, no. Matter comes from the non-recognition of the five lights.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Namdrol said:

In a real sense, however there is neither mind no matter. Mind and matter are equally produced through non-recognition of the basis i.e. essence, nature and energy.

deepbluehum said:

The essence is emptiness (the middle way). Nature (clarity) and energy (continuous) are also emptiness, let's not forget. There's no unified field of consciousness. So I don't fully agree with "matter is conscious." Nothing is conscious. Consciousness is just an illusion. I think the Dzogchen tantras support my take. Without this key bit, Dzogchen becomes Upanishadic.

Malcolm wrote:

I haven't forgotten.

I did not say there was a unified field of consciousness. Nor is there a unified field of matter.

It is incorret to say nothing is conscious. This is to deny the illusion. The best thing you can say is that consciousness is like a moon in the water, it is neither true nor is it false. But the same goes for matter.

Practically speaking however, ancient Dzogchen tantras and instructions completely

dispense with the lower yāna dichotomy between nāma and rūpa. For example, the Rigpa Rangshar names the vāyu or lung, that generates consciousness in the body.

So little has been published on the important Dzogchen tantras, that most people (apart from those literate in Tibetan who are not wasting their time translating repetitious sadhanas) really have very little idea what the true position of Dzogchen as a system is regarding this or that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

deepbluehum said:

...but where does the experience beyond words come into play?

Malcolm wrote:

One will not know the definition of vidyā until one has that personal experience or direct perception upon which that knowedge, vidyā, is predicated. But once one has that knowledge, then the definition will be as obvious to one as the taste of sugar.

The purpose of path of Dzogchen is to discover than knowledge, remove doubts concerning it, and continue in confidence about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes it would be good if Namdrol would clarify this.

But the tantras are different from Dzogchen - this needs to be pointed out.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen tantras are not different from Dzogchen. They define, delineate, explicate and explain Dzogchen since they arise out of the state of realization of Samantabhadra directly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes it would be good if Namdrol would clarify this.

But the tantras are different from Dzogchen - this needs to be pointed out.

deepbluehum said:

He did. Consciousness is a physiological process. You guys have your Philosophy 101 blinders on.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, consciousness arises from the admixture of karmavāyus with the rtsal of rigpa located in the heart.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

To Dechen Norbu:

As Namdrol said: Consciousness is clearly defined in the ancient Dzogchen tantras, as well as seminal instructions such as the Khandro Nyinthig, as a physiological phenomena.

Dechen Norbu said:

I guess it depends on what we consider consciousness, if it has levels and so on and so forth.

If you imply that once the body dies we become unconscious, a la annihilationism, such is not implied by the tantras. But Namdrol can confirm and also refine the terms.

Malcolm wrote:

Matter is conscious. Specifically, the function of consciousness is connected with rlung, the air element. They are actually one and the same. When this body dies, in the bardo a "mental" body is formed out of the air element. In this our stream of afflictions and karmas continues. There is no contradiction between rebirth, and the notion that mind and matter are not two different things. Instead, we must come to understand that minds are a function of matter, and specifically, teachings like Dzogchen (and Vajrayāna to a lesser extent) show this because our liberation is entirely dependent on understanding our physical embodiment, why it happens, how it happens and what to do about it.

In a real sense, however there is neither mind nor matter. Mind and matter are equally produced through non-recognition of the basis i.e. essence, nature and energy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Translators

Content:

heart said:

The question was ... is it a must like JLA considers it.

I guess it is, if you are following the SMS training.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

If you ever wish to get to level II it is. But SMS is not a requirement, for example, AFAIK, Longsal and SMS are not related. SMS is for people who want to have more detailed explanation of the fine points.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

Yes - so no mind/body dualism.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. This is an atavism of the nine yantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: value of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Will said:

So you find little or no usefulness in the 3 stage prajñā of Literary, leading to Contemplative leading to Real Mark prajñā?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, your first category is misleading, śrūti means "hearing" and "listening". It does not mean studying books. To whom should we listen? A person qualified to give teachings. The prajñā that results is called "śrūtamayī prajñā". Without this vital step, no amount of reading books will awaken the prajñā of the path.

Then we have the prajñā that comes from reflection, cintā-mayī prajñā. In my estimation, reading may constitute a part of this prajñā.

Then finally, you have bhāvanā-mayī prajñā, the prajñā born of practice.

But the exercise by some to become expert in the tenet systems of this or that ancient Abidharma schools, for example, or to become expert in pramāṇa, and so on, completely misses the mark of Dharma practice and realization.

I don't say these things idly. I say these things because I observe many people over the years, westerners as well as so called Geshes, Lamas, Khenpos and so on, who, while being quite expert in myriad ancient opinions about this and that fine point of Buddhist philosophy, nevertheless never succeed in integrating the meaning of the Dharma into their personal life. And so for these people, Dharma remains a religion and a culture, rather than a personal experience.

N

-

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 2nd, 2012 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

People who are blind at birth do not dream with images - they dream with sounds as long as they were not born deaf. Those that have lost their sight later on in life do dream with images but the images are blurred - not well defined at all.

Malcolm wrote:

And you know this how?

Andrew108 said:

As to Dzogchen - well there is the concept 'Dzogchen' and that is brain-based - what we think we know about Dzogchen. But genuine dharma - genuine dzogchen - it's not a causal vehicle and so we can never 'see' it with the brain - we can never figure it out with the brain - genuine Dzogchen can't be 'drawn' by the brain as a result of analysis (unlike other vehicles). In that sense it escapes us - escapes being brain-based and could be said to be beyond the brain.

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, the differentiation between mind and matter is considered a delusion, as is the differentiation between sentient and non-sentient. Consciousness is clearly defined in the ancient Dzogchen tantras, as well as seminal instructions such as the Khandro Nyinthig, as a physiological phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Translators

Content:

Sönam said:

About retreats ...

- 1) Ordinary preliminaries
- 2) Extrordinary preliminaries
- 3) zhi gnas and lhag mthong ... mental quietness and higher vision.
- 4) bskyed rim ... developping phase on Yidam. Minimum 100 days.
- 5) rdzogs rim ... perfection phase with steng sgo and 'og sgo instructions
- 6) external and internal disjunctions of samsara-nirvana. phyi nang 'khor 'das ru shan dbye ba.
- 7) 3 doors. sgo gsum sbyang ba.
- 8) rig pa'i rtsal dbang. khregs chod.
- 9) more than one retreat on thod rgal.

Sönam

Namdrol said:

This is all covered in SMS training.

dakini_boi said:

In SMS, one actually does the traditional ngondro?

Malcolm wrote:

One to three weeks of each (sans prostrations).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

Will said:

Namdrol, Be more precise, yet please elaborate. Which major texts, if any, have value in stimulating growth in prajna by the student.

Malcolm wrote:

All intellectual studies contribute to defiled prajñā, Buddhist and non-buddhist. But they do not necessarily contribute to undefiled prajñā, the realization of which after all is the point of the Dharma.

So the question should be "which texts contribute to the growth of undefiled prajñā",

and the answer to that, sadly, is none of them, should one's study not be balanced with qualified practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

maybay said:

According to a global swarm of post-history trolls.

Malcolm wrote:

Wow, in my 18 years of being on the internet and participating in internet Buddhist forums, no one has ever accused me of being a troll. First time for everything I guess.

I guess, having studied in detail tenet systems directly in Tibetan according to the presentations of many masters, and having taught Abhidharma and so on, I just don't share the starry eyed idealism some still maintain for elaborate conceptual infrastuctures.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Translators

Content:

Sönam said:

that it is a secondary practice that one practice depending on circumstances, JLA says that a lot of practices are necessary ... as an exemple, in the introduction of "Principes de la pureté primordiale" (on Khenpo Gangshar) he says about Dzogchen (my translation) : "The practitioner which engages in that Path must follows the following cursus of instruction", then follows a list of 9 retreats, some of them quite long, and six must be realized before to be introduced. In those retreats some concerne vajrayana practices (bskyed rim and rdzogs rim).

Sönam

Clarence said:

Sönam,

Would you mind listing the 9 retreats JLA mentions? Also, where can I find Principes de la pureté primordiale? My French isn't perfect but I can get by.

Many thanks, C

Sönam said:

It has been published by les éditions Khyung-Lung which is not on the normal market.

You can ask for the catalog at <mailto:khyunglungeditions@yahoo.com>... this is very private/secret. But it is a very interesting publisher, with many titles.

About retreats ...

- 1) Ordinary preliminaries
- 2) Extrordinary preliminaries
- 3) zhi gnas and lhag mthong ... mental quietness and higher vision.
- 4) bskyed rim ... developping phase on Yidam. Minimum 100 days.
- 5) rdzogs rim ... perfection phase with steng sgo and 'og sgo instructions
- 6) external and internal disjunctions of samsara-nirvana. phyi nang 'khor 'das ru shan dbye ba.
- 7) 3 doors. sgo gsum sbyang ba.
- 8) rig pa'i rtsal dbang. khregs chod.
- 9) more than one retreat on thod rgal.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

This is all covered in SMS training.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 9:17 AM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

Namdrol said:

The idea that calling vidyā "self" will get you to where you want to go.

The purpose of that passage (which is largely cribbed from the cycle connected with the bardo thos grol) is to point out that all these different systems are aimed an discovering the real state. It does not mean that they are all equally successful in their endeavor.

N

deepbluehum said:

I agree. I wasn't saying it was. My take on Shabkar's point is that words cannot be mistaken for the view. Garuda is about Dzogchen obviously. Saying vidya is not going to get you vidya either. Neither will knowing the definition. I'm saying there is wiggle room and you could even use the word "Self" as Saraha did. In that case, he was sort of tongue in cheek, but in context, you get the point of mahamudra. Like that.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you know the actual definition of vidyā, than this means you have that

knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

shel said:

Let me see if I've got this straight. In the relative cause & effect sense there is first cause, but in the absolute sense a first cause makes no sense?

Malcolm wrote:

Ignorance also has a cause, hence there is no first cause.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

deepbluehum said:

So here, you can call it awareness, self-awareness, or as Shabkar Rinpoche says, even "Self."

Namdrol said:

This is a very common misunderstanding of Shabkar.

deepbluehum said:

A mistranslation?

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that calling vidyā "self" will get you to where you want to go.

The purpose of that passage (which is largely cribbed from the cycle connected with the bardo thos grol) is to point out that all these different systems are aimed at discovering the real state. It does not mean that they are all equally successful in their endeavor.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 1st, 2012 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

deepbluehum said:

So here, you can call it awareness, self-awareness, or as Shabkar Rinpoche says, even "Self."

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very common misunderstanding of Shabkar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

heart said:

There really don't need to be any verbal instruction at all for the direct introduction to take place.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

I do not agree with this in terms of ordinary people.

heart said:

The first time I read that was like 25 years ago in "The crystal and the way of the light" I was a bit chocked, but I have come to accept it fully. Also, sometimes I think that there are no "ordinary" people that are interested in Dzogchen.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

A more clear presentation is presented in song of the vajra book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Dry Hump of Buddhist Philosophy

Content:

kirtu said:

Buddhist philosophy is a description of enlightened view from various perspectives.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is the scat of ancient Buddhist intellectuals trying to understand the meaning of the teachings, and in many cases, unsuccessfully.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- Would be the books from the Hara Krishna written in Vedic or Sanskrit or a mix of both?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahābharata, Ramayāna, etc., these great epics are written classical Sanskrit.

kalden yungdrung said:

- What is then the difference between Vedic Sanskrit and Sanskrit ?

Malcolm wrote:

Vedic Sanskrit is the language the Vedas are written in. These texts are quite ancient, and the brahmins claim they have no author, they are self-manifested.

kalden yungdrung said:

- What is formal Sanskrit?

Malcolm wrote:

It dates from the great classic of Sanskrit grammar written by Pāṇini, sometimes in the 6th century BCE.

kalden yungdrung said:

So when it is understood it well then is there a great difference between Sanskrit and Sanskrit so are the related translations.

Very difficult to get insight into the right translations here due to the many Sanskrit languages.

Malcolm wrote:

The somewhat artificial term "Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit" is the language of the sutras and tantras from India. Most of these tantras have legendary origins in Oḍḍiyāna as well.

kalden yungdrung said:

In case of Indian Dzogchen, understandable that you do prefer Sanskrit instead of Tibetan, because of the exact used Sanskrit terms.

Malcolm wrote:

From an academic point of view, even one believes the Dzogchen tantras were largely written in Tibet rather than India, etc., they articulated the teachings in terms of a terminology predicated on Sanskrit and for example, the Rigpa Rangshar has a whole chapter devoted to terms which are presented in an Indic form, such as dhātu for dbying and so on. Therefore, since these texts clearly reference Sanskrit, key terms are better backtranslated.

In terms of bon texts, I believe it is better to use Kuntuzangpo and rigpa. Also bonku, longku, etc. However, since these terms identical to usage in Buddhism, also there is no fault of the Sanskrit equivalents are used.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

heart said:

There really don't need to be any verbal instruction at all for the direct introduction to take place.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I do not agree with this in terms of ordinary people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

You and the zombification again, Mariusz...

You are being haunted by that idea.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he is big into no reference point, but inexpressibility is not his forté, since he keeps talking on and on using many reference points to talk about no reference points. He'll get over it eventually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Translators

Content:

heart said:

I don't think it is important at all to be scholar when translating Dzogchen texts, but it is very important to receive the Gurus permission and blessing as well as help to resolve difficult issues in the texts. If not it will lack the blessing of the lineage.

The same might be true for Tantric texts.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is very important to be a scholar AND have personal experience (real blessings) in

Dzogchen teachings.

Dzogchen tantras are not easy to translate. They require detailed and fairly comprehensive knowledge of all nine yānas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is not necessary to elevate everything immediately to ultimate truth, unless of course you are trying to shut the conversation down.

Mariusz said:

But it is more not necessary to make division between ultimate truth and conventional truth, since another reference point.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it is not even necessary to mention ultimate truth since it is another reference point.

Checkmate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

steveb1 said:

Please forgive if this issue has been beaten to death around here, but I am looking for a short explanation of the seeming absence of a First Cause in Buddhism.

Namdrol said:

There are no causes that are not also effects.

The Buddhist POV is beginninglessness -- we have not problem with infinite regress, we accept it, in this case.

Dharmakāya is not a cause.

N

Mariusz said:

"beginninglessness"- according to madhyamaka there was never such reference point in the first place. "First Cause" also never was in the first place. The freedom from all these reference points is just called sunyata.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not necessary to elevate everything immediately to ultimate truth, unless of course you are trying to shut the conversation down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: First Cause in Buddhism (?)

Content:

steveb1 said:

Please forgive if this issue has been beaten to death around here, but I am looking for a short explanation of the seeming absence of a First Cause in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no causes that are not also effects.

The Buddhist POV is beginninglessness -- we have not problem with infinite regress, we accept it, in this case.

Dharmakāya is not a cause.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 7:24 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

When i understood it well then is seeing with an object and subject not seeing the Natural State.

This because the dualisms are not integrated by the Natural State, whereas the Natural State does encompass everything.

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not "seeing" with a subject and object that is a problem. It is attachment to the same as a discrete or real subject and object that is the problem.

When you eyes sees, it sees an object. This is not a problem for as long you are do not reify this as a discrete subject and object.

People are really confused about this because of a) a poor understanding of Yogacara

(mind only) b) confusing Advaita with Buddhist non-dualism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 7:21 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- Are these Tantras who are written in Apabrahmsa of Vedic origin?
- Mention please some of those Apabrahmsa Tantras and the author.

KY[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Large sections of Buddhist sutras and Tantras, such as Hevajra, are in a kind of mixed Sanskrit and Apabhramsa.

No Vedic text is in anything other than Sanskrit. Vedic = Vedic Sanskrit.

Buddhist mahayāna sutras of the classical period also show plenty of evidence of being adapted from local dialects and being rewritten or worked out of Indic dialects into a more formal Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 6:58 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Yes if we take the advice from Lopon Tenzin Namdak serious and take Tibetan language for Tibetan Dzogchen.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

But of course, in practice, also Bonpos use the terms dharmakāya for bon sku, etc. Bon = Chos, Chos = Dharma, Dharma = Bon.

And there is no "Tibetan Dzogchen" per se. All Dzogchen teachings come from lands other than Tibet. Including Zhang Zhung Nyen Gyud. Taphihritsa is not a Tibetan name.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 6:50 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Sönam said:

In the case of Dzogchen terms, they originated from Oddiyana, not India ... Vimalamitra and other pandits went to see Garab Dorje from Nalanda. So is it not better to use Tibetan words?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, since in the titles of the seventeen man ngag sde tantras we find that rigpa is the translation for vidyā, just as byang chub sems is the translation for bodhicitta in the titles of sems sde tantras.

Further, Oddiyāna language is not a distant cousin to Sanskrit, quite the opposite, in Oddiyāna as well, Sanskrit was the language of scholars. Oddiyāna language is a kind of dialect of the Indic language spoken in the that region.

Large numbers of tantras originating in India are not in Sanskrit, properly speaking, but have sections which are in Apabrahmsa, which is a kind of dialect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Namdrol said:

That is why I just use vidyā in the same way that we use dharmakāya, etc.

Sönam said:

If you use vidyā, why can't we simply use rigpa then, and forget all that discussion? ... anyway rigpa/vidyā has only an interest for those who know about.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

One can, but in my translations, when I must use a dharma term, I prefer the Sanskrit original to the Tibetan if possible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 30th, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Yes the term Rigpa, is a very difficult word to translate, sure when it is related to

awareness.

Also is it clear that Rigpa could also be intelligence, that was also one of my earlier suggestion.

Namdrol said:

In my opinion, translating rigpa as "awareness" is simply wrong. Intelligence is also not good, again IMO.

In this case, knowledge is best. Why? Because rigpa is opposite to ma rig pa. Knowledge is the opposite of ignorance.

N

Adamantine said:

Knowledge has a connotation of the conceptual, or merely factual. This is most likely due to it's common usage, but it still sticks. I think because of this it is a bit tainted for use as a translation for Rigpa.

Also, I would propose that the timeless quality of Rigpa would be better served by the term "knowing" than "knowledge", as knowledge also has a connotation of a static quality of an object or subject known by the mind. Maybe a conditional of "non-conceptual knowing" would be better, -- but then, look at the definition of intuition from Merriam Webster : direct perception of truth, fact, etc., independent of any reasoning process; immediate apprehension. This does seem to fit better, however it has it's own connotations due to common usage that could cause other misunderstandings.

Malcolm wrote:

That is why I just use vidyā in the same way that we use dharmakāya, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 29th, 2012 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

alpha said:

Tsal, rolpa, and gdang refer to what the practitioner is able to experience. Tsal is at the nirnanakāya level, which mean it can be observed by ordinary people.

Malcolm wrote:

i'm sorry but i don't understand how this relates to my question .
what is the relationship between rolpa and sambhogakaya?[/quote]

Rolpa is the energy of the base at the Sambhogakāya level.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 29th, 2012 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, not at all. Rolpa is always internal, never external.

alpha said:

Yeah...sorry.I didnt formuate the question in the right way.I didnt mean to say that tsal is becoming rolpa and rolpa remains external .

And would it be accurate to say that at the moment of rolpa the field of sambogakaya is being actualized ?

Malcolm wrote:

Tsal, rolpa, and gdang refer to what the practitioner is able to experience. Tsal is at the nirnanakāya level, which mean it can be observed by ordinary people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 29th, 2012 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Causes and conditions. That's where we are.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But we don't have to remain there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 29th, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

what is "dependent arising" if not causality? "When this arises, that arises. When this subsides, that subsides". Either the one arising causes the other, or they are completely unrelated. If caused, what is the mechanism? If unrelated, then whence karma, rebirth, and other core Buddhist doctrines? If oak trees do not arise from maple seeds, then theres still something governing the illusory manifestations, and they are not arbitrary. Since this is the case, again, what is the mechanism, if not causality?

Malcolm wrote:

Relatively speaking, cause and effect are neither the same nor are they different. If they are the same, this is a problem, if they are different, this is a problem -- the sole solution and the one advanced by Candrakīrti, et al in commenting on MMK is the one I just mentioned.

Anyway, cause and condition are thoroughly deconstructed in MMK 1.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

alpha said:

But you have to agree that this is how lots of teachers instruct their students by giving them directions of how the knowledge can turn on itself.

Malcolm wrote:

I have never heard my teachers (ChNN, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa) say anything like this ever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

alpha said:

"Oneself encountering oneself" or "like is likewise liberated by like" can be seen only if one has familiarity with the limitless or boundless aspect of mind and its knowing quality.

The knowing then can turn on itself and the display is recognized as oneself.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the whole point that no one gets e.g. knowing does not need to turn in on itself.

This is a hangover from the idea of *svasaṃvedana* (rang rig) used in Buddhist logic. That step of knowing turning in on itself is not needed, in fact, it is a deviation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

who is closest to appearance-only than mind-only when they deny external objects?

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that we do not posit some substratum like the ālayavijñāna to account for those appearances. Nor are we denying the appearance of external objects. We are merely stating the obvious i.e. that those appearances are not real, and hence are completely equivalent with illusions. The charge of nihilism is not appropriate because we are not denying appearances. The charge of eternalism is not appropriate because those unreal appearances cannot be found on analysis. We are saying that appearances are not false, because they appear, but they are not true, because they cannot be found, just like the appearance of a moon in the water. We are saying that all phenomena are like that. Similarly illusions too are not false, because the elephants, and so on of the illusion appear, but they are not true, because when examined they cannot be found. This approach to the two truths is called the upadesha transmission of Madhyamaka. It is much superior to the Madhyamaka of analysis which is focused on rejecting wrong views of the lower tenet systems.

In fact, according to Rongzom, the purpose of the affirming negation is reject the views of an opponent, while affirming your own, in the form of a proof. The purpose of the non-affirming negation is merely to eliminate the point of view of an opponent.

Madhyamaka only has non-affirming negations, and does not make use of affirming negations at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

alpha said:

This is what is being said in Golden letters in the commentary on the first statement "Whatever may arise ,appearing as external phenomena to the individual,is merely one's own internal state of existence manifesting externally ,that is to say ,it is merely the potentiality or creative energy of awareness becoming visible to the individual".

Is this what you are saying?

Malcolm wrote:

" Oneself encountering oneself (For example, just as one encounters people of the same language in some country of a different language, one is recognized, when anger is recognized, it is liberated) is the self-sufficient power (Therefore, like is likewise liberated by like, there is no other antidote) of whatever appears being oneself (A phenomena that is otherwise cannot be found elsewhere)."

This is my rendering of the same passage, not having examined Reynold's version. It sticks very closely to the Tibetan, and has the added advantage of including the interlinear footnotes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 8:20 PM

Title: Re: Understanding of the Natural State

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

To be in the Natural State = to experience or be aware of these creations of Lights, sounds and rays.

Noisiness would mean here the inner sounds as well the outer sounds.

The outer things are reflected on the crystal, without disturbing the crystal.

The inner things are emanating from the potential of the crystal to create.

Mutsog Marro

KY[/color]

alpha said:

How can anything be thought of being internal or external while in rigpa?

My understanding is that while in rigpa the appearances cannot be thought of being separate from knowing or clarity.

Malcolm wrote:

Rig pa means knowing appearances as your own state. Ma rig is ignorance of this fact. But rig pa is not a type of solipsism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Again see above i doubt that really. If above mentioned persons were not academics of such a high degree then i would agree.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, I am very underwhelmed by academic scholars, especially European ones. I find European Academia very rigid and prejudiced. It is very hard in European Academia to be taken seriously if you are a practitioner.

kalden yungdrung said:

Bonpos have so their translators and they are many. Most of them have a western title Phd / prof. so it is not only John who does the job.

Malcolm wrote:

"PhD" does not mean very much to me. It is just a title for getting a job. I have meant many PhD's in Buddhist studies from Harvard and so on who are not very learned about Buddhism in general. They are learned in writing papers, much of which is filled with crap.

kalden yungdrung said:

English would be a combination of French and German when i understood that well. In German one can express oneself also very exact.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, German is a very precise language, and in some respects is better for translating Tibetan texts than English because both languages are agglutinative. Also German can reproduce the subject-object-verb structure of Tibetan quite well, whereas English cannot.

Nevertheless, since English is forged out Anglo-Saxon, French, Latin and Greek, and easily absorbs terms from other languages such as nirvana, samsara, etc. In my opinion, since English is now the international language of advanced scholarship, this proves that English is the best language to translation Dharma texts into, all thanks to the British Empire, Britannia Rule the Waves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 7:16 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Jean-Luc Achard is a native french speaking person and his English is praised by prof. Henk Blezer of university Leiden (NL). It is a pity that he is not here present aboard.

Malcolm wrote:

I welcome JLA's presence. I respect him a lot. I don't know Hank Blezer, but I am rather unimpressed by a lot of his writing, specifically on Tibetan medicine (something about which I definitely know more since I am a trained sman pa). Also Henk Blezer is not a native English speaker.

kalden yungdrung said:

Indeed the translations in English out of Tibetan from Jean-Luc Achard do belong to the best Tibetan translations.

Malcolm wrote:

JLA has some funny translation equivalents that I think are odd, but in general he understands the meaning of Dzogchen texts.

kalden yungdrung said:

So it is not true that you as a native English speaking person, together of course linked to your education, would be better in English translations than a Frenchman like Jean Luc Achard from the Sorbonne / Paris. You would probably have a better accent then JLA, i guess.

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone translating into their own native language will do better than someone who is not.

kalden yungdrung said:

But nevertheless, i would point out the necessity for a standard, for Dzogchen terms. This because we deal here with exact the same experiences.....

Malcolm wrote:

That is not going to happen anytime soon. Dzogchen Community uses its jargon following ChNN and Adriano Clemente; Padma Publishing has their jargon; Rangjung Yeshe has its jargon; Tony Duff has his (awkward) jargon; Dharmacakra Translation committee has its; You Bonpos have yours following John Reynolds primarily as far as I can see, etc.

kalden yungdrung said:

One can never add or subtract things related to Dzogchen, that is clear. So i guess it is due to the English language shortcomings, that we explain the same things with different words, or we make a mistake with the right following order of Dzogchen experiences.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no shortcoming in the English language. Actually, English, being the European language with the highest number of synonyms, the most heterogenous language in Europe, is the most ideal for translations, especially translations of a technical nature because it is rigid about word order in way that Romance and Tuetonic languages are not.

Further, even within Dzogchen literature, the same things are explained with different terminology. The personal experience of Dzogchen is vastly more important than the words.

kalden yungdrung said:

It shows that Dzogchen can be approached on different ways explained by different Dzogchen Masters.

Malcolm wrote:

What I observe is that for the most part the language this or that master uses depends on who they get as a translator and when. These days, none of Reynolds' conventions are in vogue in Dzogchen Community.

A lot of ChNN's translations of terms depend in the fact that he started teaching Dzogchen in Italian first, and then merely translated his Italian translations into English, for example, lhun grub in Italian is autoperfezione or self-perfection in English.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 11:06 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

it would be like saying the cake does not truly exist.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you saying the cake truly exists?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

What do you think about the qualities of our Yongdzin Rinpoche?

Malcolm wrote:

I only met him once, and never took teachings from him, but he is a great master.

kalden yungdrung said:

He is assisted by many very well learned people who have a university degree, and some of them can translate Tibetan very well like Jean Luc Achard, Donatelli, Snellgrove, Ermakovi, John Reynolds etc. and they all make the same translations about self awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Achard, Donatelli, and Ermakovi are not native English speakers (as you are not); Snellgrove is ancient, his book on Bon is 50 years old before people had any understanding of the nuances of Dzogchen, and Reynolds too was educated in the 60's and has habits which persist from that era.

N

kalden yungdrung said:

i guess there are persons around Lopon Tenzin Namdak who can translate Tibetan as well as you do or even maybe better.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but I will stand by my opinion. You and I have gone back and forth on this one too many times. It is not useful. So we will agree to disagree.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Did Xuanzang meet Candrakīrti?

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

Nope. Anyway, at this point in my life, I find all this Buddhist philosophy boring and don't take it very seriously anymore. It was a useful tool, but eventually it is a distraction. I am curious. Do you mean academically rationalizing the activity of meditation and the insights of meditation - or programmatic or thematic meditations altogether, (bhavanakrama).

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, what I mean is that Buddhist Philosophy and tenet systems is pretty much a dry hump. It does not lead anywhere. In the end it is merely dry intellectualization divorced from personal experience.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 28th, 2012 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

and so I do. And I can explain their existence. They exist by way of mental imputation, as because of this, there is no need to assert independence.

Namdrol said:

Then there is no difference between fire circles and firebrands since they both depend on mental imputation.

Mate in one move.

cloudburst said:

correct, no difference in terms of the ultimate.

Conventionally, big big difference.

mustn't advise sentient beings that drinking mirage water and actual water are same

Malcolm wrote:

But since conventional imputations are deluded by definition, it is only from the point of view of the deluded that mirage water and "water" are different.

Checkmate.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Did Xuanzang meet Candrakirti?

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

based on Atisha's praise of Candrakirti's works as the sole path to liberation

I stand corrected! :)

... although I hope I can suggest Atisha's praise of Candrakirti doesn't mean I am to be shunned as an icchantika!

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Anyway, at this point in my life, I find all this Buddhist philosophy boring and don't take it very seriously anymore. It was a useful tool, but eventually it is a distraction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

and so I do. And I can explain their existence. They exist by way of mental imputation, as because of this, there is no need to assert independence.

Malcolm wrote:

Then there is no difference between fire circles and firebrands since they both depend on mental imputation.

Mate in one move.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Did Xuanzang meet Candrakīrti?

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

DON'T FORGET: Candrakīrti was made famous because it was a keystone of the State Religion in Tibet much later. And Tibetan literature was translated and printed by the USA because it annoyed the Chines with whom we were in a Cold War.)

Malcolm wrote:

No, Candrakīrti was made famous in Tibet because of the clarity of his presentation of Madhyamaka and the fact that his works superceded those of Bhavaviveka as the dominant voice in Madhyamaka from the 12th century onwards based on Atisha's praise of Candrakīrti's works as the sole path to liberation in the eleventh century.

It is most likely that Candrakīrti lived between 600-650.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Did Xuanzang meet Candrakīrti?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Candrakīrti was a rather late, much later than Xuanzang -- Candrakīrti was a contemporary of Candragomin.

Leo Rivers said:

Xuanzang and Candrakīrti?

Nalanda was actually a University - meaning it consisted of colleges - and within a college students would cluster around a teacher in a department who was department-head or a popular "thesis adviser".

The way teachers became famous was to defeat a rival philosophy in a debate that was famous because it upheld the reputation of the School.

NEXT, a biography must survive relating a teacher's "wins" in debates. Xuanzang's debate at Nalanda survived because he defended the Yogacara which met applause in its contemporary context and was later supported by later rich patron who paid to have books telling us about it printed.

Xuanzang's Biography largely survived because Xuanzang had state support in China. That's why his debates with Kumarajiva are known. (Wriggens, p. 30) And it is important "he defeated all challengers (ibid, page 53) - I think a draw is passed over in silence.

It seems Dharmapala's reputation at Nalanda rested on his effectiveness at calming down Madhyamaka/Yogacara tensions by offering reconciling Views, "(Lausthaus, page 403-405), as per his commentary on Aryadeva's Satka sastra which is Dharmapala's refutation of Bhavavivika's Maddyamaka critique of Yogacara.

The Yogacarabhumi is the reason Hsuan Tzang went to India. It was this defense of Dharmapala's that actually makes its appearance in his own Ch'eng Wei-shin lun of Dharmapala's works.

Candrakīrti was against this spirit of the times at Nalanda. (my guess). Why?

Dharmapala was the was trained by Silabhadra who taught Yogacara to Hsuan Tzang. (Wriggens, page 131)

It may be Candrakīrti was most active subsequently to Hsuan Tzang, (this seems the implication from Lausthaus, page 412, and his opinion on page 447) He doesn't appear in Wriggin's index.

SO I believe Candrakīrti may have met with some disapproval at Nalanda - Candrakīrti was at odds with the 'spirit of the day' at Nalanda. Candrakīrti was made famous TO US by voicing the State Religion position in Tibet much later.)

Lausthaus, D., 2003. Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogacara Buddhism and the Ch'eng Wei-shih Lun, RoutledgeCurzon.

Wriggens, S., 2003. The Silk Road Journey With Xuanzang, Basic Books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 7:21 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

Anders Honore said:

I see a lot of talk here about the status of phenomena, whether they lack essence, can be accurately cognised, and so forth, which to me looks like a kind of pseudo-ontology.

Malcolm wrote:

This is primarily a result of Tsongkhapa's over-intellectualization of Madhyamaka and his inability to differentiate between Candrakīrti's POV and Bhavaviveka's, and his ideological commitment to the superiority of Candrakīrti's presentation.

The idea that Candra's presentation is superior to Bhava's is not unique, but what is

unique is Tsongkhapa's simultaneous commitment to the language of logic as a tool to explain Madhyamaka, and as a result we see strange formulations such as "Prasangikas" do not refute valid cognizers and so on, when in fact they clearly do. In point of fact, that Prasangikas who do not reject valid cognizers are only the followers of Tsongkhapa. The rest, from Candrakirti, to Jayananda, and so on, do refute them.

Also, Buddhist logic never made significant inroads into Chinese philosophy, so much of this talk about valid cognition and so on would sound foreign to a Chinese Buddhist. But because of the trenchant polemics in India between Buddhists and non-Buddhists, there was much discussion of valid cognition and what entailed, since the whole field of pramana was adopted by the Buddhists defensively.

However, during the time of Nagarjuna there was no well developed school of Buddhist logic, and so we see in texts like Vigrahavyavartani a thorough rejection of the whole notion of valid cognizers since in the end the notion of a valid cognition depends on notions of inherency. So naturally the Chinese were not that interested.

However, in response to non-Buddhists, Vasubandhu began to articulate the first epistemological responses to non-Buddhist criticism, his disciple, Dignaga, formulated the foundations and Buddhist pramana, Dharmakirti elaborated it, and the rest is history. Pramana came to be regarded as one of the Panca Vidya, the five sciences with its understandable impact on Tibetan Buddhism.

Of course in Dzogchen, the principle is not the two truths, but simple vidyā and avidyā. By comparison, there is only one truth in Dzogchen teachings, vidyā. The rest, falling under the heading of avidyā (ignorance) is fundamentally false — for example, in the same way that a jaundiced man sees everything as yellow, those who suffering from the jaundice of ignorance never see things as they truly are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 7:04 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

mmm said:

to cone: In kama dzogchen semde contains 18 rigpai calwang, longde contains vajra bridge and mengngagde empowerment of 17 tantras, which is by nature given in rather tantric style. In Dupa Do there seems to be different ways of giving it. e.g. Trulshik Rinpoche gave a specific empowerment name for each of the 9 yanas wang are contained in it, also it took one day for one yana. For practise they say Narag Tongdrug contains the essence of all. Or just Vajrasattva single form. Something like this is given also to keep the blessing of the whole cycle. good luck, mmm

Pero said:

So the entire initiation lasts 9 days?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is a very long initiation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 6:41 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Maybe in additon, handy to read this link:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=78&t=8052>"
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Mutsog Marro

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I frankly disagree with calling rang rig self-awareness for a number of reasons, not least of which I am a native English speaker, and understand the nuances of English better than LTN.

But in the end, if one has understood what rang rig actually is, that is more important than the word that we use for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 27th, 2012 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

is an image of you savaging a straw man. Prasnaṅgikas never refute valid cognition, although they do strongly and continuously refute intrinsic existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Nagārajuna refutes valid cognition in the Vīṅśatikāśāstra. Since he does not accept it, ergo, neither does Madhyamaka in general.

Namdrol said:

You may say, for example, that "the cognition of the firebrand as unreal is a valid cognition".

Malcolm wrote:

This is one type of valid cognition

Namdrol said:

This is sloppy reasoning. In this case we may define one type of valid cognition as the cognition of the unreality of phenomena. There may be other valid cognitions that apprehend conventions whose ultimate nature is unreality.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you must admit that valid objects exist. Then you must explain their existence. This can only be done if you accept independent existence.

Namdrol said:

Hence we can state without error that all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions, as it is proved eloquently by Rongzom Chökyi Pandita.

Rongzom got it wrong. Present his case and we'll pull that apart also. I've read the Koppl book,

Malcolm wrote:

I have not read her book. But I have read Rongzom.

Namdrol said:

This may be frightening to those who cling to notions of relative and ultimate truth.

I do find your reasoning frightening, but not because I cling to any such notions, though I do uphold them, as did all the great Madhyamikas, esp Buddha Shakyamuni. The really frightening bit is where you abandon the Madhyamaka by abandoning the two truths. Or do you? Perhaps you accept the two truths in a way that is free from clinging?

Malcolm wrote:

"Since the jinas have stated nirvana is the sole truth, at that time, what wise person would think 'the rest is not the opposite'."

-- Yuktiṣaṣṭika

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

cloudburst said:

In your example, the firebrand is appearing but unreal, but it appears to a valid mind, free from causes of error. The circle is simply non-existent, the mind to which it appears is a wrong awareness. You are equivocating sir.

Malcolm wrote:

If you assert that the mind apprehending the firebrand is valid, you must also have a valid object of cognition. This requires the prameya, the object of a valid cognition, which bear intrinsic characteristics from its own side; it must be a valid object prior to its apprehension.

In order to have a valid cognition (pramana) there must be a prameya. But if you claim, as you have, that even the fire brand is unreal, you have eliminated the basis for your claim that a mind that apprehends it can be valid since the definition of a valid cognition depends on the apprehension of a valid object — a firebrand is not such an object, since you admit it is unreal.

If a valid cognition is valid, it must be valid intrinsically, in which case it needs not depend on a valid object of cognition. Likewise, a valid object of cognition must be intrinsically valid in its own right, independently of a valid cognition. In which case, all minds apprehending valid objects are valid, just as all objects apprehended by a valid cognition must be valid. Since this is so, the whole basis of your argument from the point of view of pramana fails, because you cannot establish the verity of valid cognition to begin with, and certainly there cannot be a valid cognition of something unreal free from error.

You may say, for example, that "the cognition of the firebrand as unreal is a valid cognition". This only works if you admit that all phenomena which are apprehensible by a valid cognition are unreal as well. In this case you are forced to define a valid cognition as the cognition of the unreality of phenomena. For that reason then, there is no good reason to make a distinction between phenomena such as fire circles, apparent, yet unreal; and fire brands, equally apparent, yet unreal. Hence we can state without error that all phenomena are completely equivalent with illusions, as it is proved eloquently by Rongzom Chökyi Pandita.

This may be frightening to those who cling to notions of relative and ultimate truth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Kilaya. said:

I find the melody of the DC Sang practice too complicated, so I simply recite the verses.
Is that okay?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not that complicated at all, but it is a Tibetan cadence so a bit hard to follow for Westerners. Often what I do it refresh my memory once by hearing a bit fo the cd before I do Rinpoche's sang. Otherwise, I use Riwo Sangchö which I know quite well.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 10:54 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

Namdrol gave the example of the stick with fire, spinning and forming an illusion of a circle.

can you hold the circle? no. illusion.

can you hold the stick? yes. not an illusion.

.

Namdrol said:

If you say the fire circle is illusory because it arises from the cause and condition of whirling a fire brand, for what reason is the fire brand not illusory, since it too arises from causes and conditions?

cloudburst said:

It is not said that the circle is an illusion becasue it arises from causes and conditions, it is said becasue there is no circle. The fire brand is not illusory because there is a firebrand.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a circle when it appears, because causes and conditions to produce that circle are present; likewise, when the causes and conditions of a firebrand exist a firebrand appears. In this way we can understand that all phenomena are equally and totally illusory because no phenomenon can appear in absence of causes and conditions for that phenomenon's appearance regardless of whether it is a fire circle or a fire brand.

Illusory means "apparent, yet unreal". So to, all phenomena are apparent, yet unreal.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community webcasts and Buddhist symbols

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Yes, I'm not really serious about any of this, before I get shouted at

I'm more poking fun at my own love of garish Vajrayana displays that show more gold than Fort Knox and the Kardashians together.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, Nouveau Riche Dharma.

A temple outfitted by Carmella Soprano.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community webcasts and Buddhist symbols

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I for one prefer a clean look.

alpha said:

i am kind of the same.

my so called shrine is a board on which i pinned various deity images to help with visualization during tun or any other DC practices. And at the base of this board i have 2 candles and incense.

mindyourmind said:

Nah, I like my teachings with all the gold and brocade you can pile on, incense, flowers and more colour than at a Liberace concert, a true tarted-up show, bells and whistles, statues and thankas in and on every surface, and then some.

Malcolm wrote:

In Merigar, all the surfaces of the Gumpa are painted -- all the deities are on the ends of the beams supporting the roof, and the ceiling is painted with the Song of the Vajra and the mantras of the Twenty Five Thigles. On the moulding between ceiling and wall are beautiful murals of the important masters of Dzogchen in Bon, Nyingma, Sakya, Kagyu and Gelug as well as major tertons, and the above his own throne is a mural of the thirteen primordial masters of Dzogchen from Nangawa Dampa down to Shakyamuni Buddha and Garab Dorje, as well as Samantabhadra and Vajrasattva.

But because most of the walls are floor to ceiling glass, there is no wall space for Thangkas.

In the Tsegylgar Gumpa we have all these huge Thangkas of Ekajati, Guru Rinpoche and three roots, Garab Dorje and Thirteen Primordial, Masters Gomadevi and so on.

So it is all based on circumstances.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community webcasts and Buddhist symbols

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

My point is simply that advanced practitioners simply do not need images, offering bowls and rupas and that the presence of these objects is for the disciples, not for the Guru or any Buddha.

mindyourmind said:

So there are no disciples at these webcasts?

Malcolm wrote:

MYM, if you look at pictures of retreats, there is always a shrine the necessary things, rupa, stupa, dharma text, and offerings. In Merigar, there is a more elaborate shrine, but still by comparison it is sparse by normal Tibetan Buddhist standards. ChNN cannot carry a shrine with him everywhere, and moreover, many times the retreats are in public venues because they can be quite well attended, sometimes 1000 people or more. So it is a little impossible to go over the top with elaborate thrones and so on on the road. ChNN likes to travel light.

But if you like that sort of thing, his throne in Merigar, his main seat is beautiful.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Navayana Buddhism

Content:

nowheat said:

for example in saying that if dukkha includes physical pain, then one can't be totally free of dukkha till after that last death

Malcolm wrote:

When free of clinging, then one is free of dukkha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 26th, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

Namdrol gave the example of the stick with fire, spinning and forming an illusion of a circle.

can you hold the circle? no. illusion.

can you hold the stick? yes. not an illusion.

.

Malcolm wrote:

If you say the fire circle is illusory because it arises from the cause and condition of whirling a fire brand, for what reason is the fire brand not illusory, since it too arises from causes and conditions?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 7:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community webcasts and Buddhist symbols

Content:

mindyourmind said:

but I for one would like to see these teachings sometimes being presented in a slightly more traditional setting.

Malcolm wrote:

When Vidyadharas presented teachings, they rarely did so in elaborate temples and shrines. Garab Dorje for example taught in a charnel ground, not in an elegant temple. I doubt very much he had a statue of Shakyamuni.

So what could be more traditional than that?

That said, at most teachings there is a streamlined shrine with a statue of Buddha or Guru Rinpoche with water offerings, candles, incense and tormas -- as PR just mentioned it is generally off camera.

But according to ChNN -- the only thing that is really essential in a shrine for a Dzogchen practitioner is a candle or light and incense (as an offering to the protectors, etc.). In my case, also I have a few symbols in our practice room, peacock feather, crystal, melong, small stupa, statue of Guru P, small thankga of Drollo. Very, very simple and sparse.

Often ChNN mentions that in this day and age it is important not to draw attention to oneself. So for example he says it is sufficient to have a white A in a thigle of five colors framed like an art print on one wall (with candle and incense burner nearby). Then this

seems to ordinary people, non-practitioners like art.

So ChNN says it is important not to make oneself a target. We do not need to show anyone we are practitioners. We do not need to have any statues of Buddha, Padmasambhava, etc. at all. Of course if we have the possibility to have a more elaborate shrine, than it is fine. But it is completely unnecessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 6:38 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

conebeckham said:

So, my understanding is that the Guhyagarbha is the crucial Kama transmission for Mahayoga Tantra practice. This Dupa Do is the crucial Kama transmission for Anuyoga Tantra practice. Is there a "Kama" transmission for Ati, as well? Khandro Nyingthik, if I am not mistaken, is Terma, and Menngakde level of Ati, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Most seems sde, virtually all klong sde and the Vima Nyinthig (despite the fact that it contains many terms of Chetsun Senge Wangchuck) along with the seventeen tanzas are Kama.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Blog (formerly Dzogchen World)...

Content:

mzaur said:

Yeah i'm not particularly sure why it's only for current members

Malcolm wrote:

Because it shows your commitment to Dzogchen Community.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Namdrol said:

Rigpa comes from recognition and is based on recognition.

gregkavarnos said:

But surely recognition necessitates a mediation. I mean there has to be something

recognised and a recogniser, right? In which case it all goes down the tubes again. I guess we can put it down to the shortcomings of language.

Malcolm wrote:

Non-dual in Dzogchen does not discount a subject and an object. It is just that subject and object are non-dual. So when you recognize your primordial state, you are recognizing your own face, as it were.

The term "recognize" is used over and over again in Dzogchen texts. It is an experiential unmediated direct recognition. That recognition is the basis for your knowledge/knowing/vidyā. Without that recognition, you are in a state of ignorance/āvidya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

Dronma said:

Sometimes, English scholars are using the Greek term Gnosis for indicating Rigpa in a more fancy way, which is wrong as I have posted in many threads before.

Because gnosis means knowledge. As Greek, I would never say that Rigpa is Gnosis (Γνώσις). But I would say that Rigpa is Anagnorisis (Αναγνώρισις), which includes etymologically the root of the term Gnosis in it, but it is more specific and can be translated in English as Recognition.

Malcolm wrote:

Rigpa comes from recognition and is based on recognition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

mzaur said:

Thank you for clarifying. So this knowledge is not a thought... it's a non-conceptual knowing. Right? I guess what confused me was that I see knowledge as having thoughts about a certain topic.

Malcolm wrote:

It is direct perception and the knowledge that results from that direct perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 25th, 2012 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

mzaur said:

Knowledge sounds so abstract. Like, I have a lot of knowledge about computers. How do I rest in that knowledge? I guess I don't understand what you mean by knowledge. Language is tricky.

To use your example of a job well done. Ok, so I 'know' I did a job well done because I have the thought, 'wow I did a great job' and the feeling of relief, satisfaction, etc.. so there is a thought and a feeling.. and you rest in that?

Malcolm wrote:

It means you rest in the knowledge you discovered through a direct perception of your own state, your primordial state. One you have this knowledge, that's it. And yes there is relief and satisfaction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

Nighthawk said:

Thanks for the clarification. That's the way I've always seen it. An elite club for the high capacity.

Mr. G said:

Namdrol clarifies the idea of capacity here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=4002&p=38072#p38072> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Capacity depends on personal interest and diligence -- nothing more.

Malcolm wrote:

Diligence means you concretely apply what you were interested to learn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Namdrol said:

Look, The Yangzab is a supplement of the Khandro Nyinthig, in some sense the Gongpa Zangthal is a supplement to the Khandro Nyinthig, etc., there are many termas that are considered to be supplements or in some way related to the KN because they are all based primarily on the klong gsal tantra and take Hayagriva and Vajrayogini Yab Yum as the main yidam of the practice.

But the Khandro Nyinthig is the first, and other termas are not the Khandro Nyinthig.

Mariusz said:

I'm not sure only about: "Khandro Nyinthig is the first, and other termas are not the Khandro Nyinthig". Since it was from dakini script of Yeshe Tsogyal. But I will ask for it when the time comes to confirm it. Nevertheless it deals with KN as you also wrote here.

Malcolm wrote:

Many termas are held to have been written down by Yeshe Tsogyal, are they all the Khandro Nyinthig? No.

The Khandro Nyinthig is a specific teaching, with a specific history, and a specific time it was supposed to have been revealed by a specific tertön at a specific place. The same is true of the Kunzang Gongdu. I do not think that most people will accept that if you received the empowerment for the Khandro Nyinthig/Yangthig that you have received the empowerment for the Kunzang Gongdu as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Mariusz said:

Since Khandro Yangtig is a supplement, so is Kunzang Gongdu.

Malcolm wrote:

It was not mine. Ask Rinpoche. [/quote]

Look, The Yangzab is a supplement of the Khandro Nyinthig, in some sense the Gongpa Zangthal is a supplement to the Khandro Nyinthig, etc., there are many termas that are considered to be supplements or in some way related to the KN because they are all based primarily on the klong gsal tantra and take Hayagriva and Vajrayogini Yab Yum as the main yidam of the practice.

But the Khandro Nyinthig is the first, and other termas are not the Khandro Nyinthig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 10:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Blog (formerly Dzogchen World)...

Content:

mzaur said:

Is this it? <https://dzogchen.tumblr.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

http://dzogchenworld.ning.com/?xg_source=msg_invite_net "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek,

Yes the term Rigpa, is a very difficult word to translate, sure when it is related to awareness.

Also is it clear that Rigpa could also be intelligence, that was also one of my earlier suggestion.

Namdrol said:

In my opinion, translating rigpa as "awareness" is simply wrong. Intelligence is also not good, again IMO.

In this case, knowledge is best. Why? Because rigpa is opposite to ma rig pa. Knowledge is the opposite of ignorance.

N

mzaur said:

Could you please explain then how "rest in rigpa" makes sense? How do you rest in knowledge?

Malcolm wrote:

"He rested in the knowledge of a job well done..."

"He rested in his knowledge of the basis...."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, the Kunzang Gondu is a completely different cycle. Yes, of course it is related to Khandro Nyinthig, since it, like the Khandro Nyinthig is rooted in the klong gsal nyi ma bar ma rgyud.

But specifically the Khandro Khandro Nyinthig is the terma of Tulku Tsultrim Dorje. The

Khandro Yantig is the supplement to this by Longchenpa. Since Peme Lingpa is considered the tulku of Longchenpa, for this reason the Kunzang Gongdu is considered to be a further supplement to teh Khandro Nyinthig -- but it is not the Khandro Nyinthig which is only two volumes long and between the Khandro Nyinthig and Yanthig, there is only one empowerment composed by Longchenpa based on teh root texts of the Khandro Nyinthig.

Mariusz said:

It is said Longchenpa during his visit in Bhutan discovered the terma but buried it again. Pema Lingpa discovered it later again. So it is not the supplement. Kunzang Gondu "is more on Khandro Nyinthig".

Malcolm wrote:

Since Khandro Yangtig is a supplement, so is Kunzang Gondu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 3:28 AM

Title: Dzogchen Blog (formerly Dzogchen World)...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

..is back up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Mariusz said:

Rinpoche gave the dzogchen cycle of initiations four or three years ago in Darnkow, Poland, but as I talked with some person it was not the full cycle. Another Rinpoche from Bhutan <http://yeshekhlorlo.mahajana.net/wp-content/gallery/materialy/awers.jpg> gave the full cycle of initiations of Khando Nyinthig in 2009 during 2 weeks.

Pero said:

Says Kunzang Gongdu, not Khandro Nyingthig. In any case, I wish there was some mailing list for these events in Europe or something.

Mariusz said:

Kunzang Gongdu Kundu, "The Totality of Samantabhadra Enlightened Intentions" is bhutanese complete terma of Khandro Nyinthig, and it also cantains other teachings like Anuyoga tsalung and tummo. Pema Linga was the one of the 5 main tertons and also the one who was the incarnation of Longchenpa up to Princess Pemasel. If you look in bio of HH Dudjom Rinpoche it was one of His main transmissions He gave, also to Bhutan.

I will inform you next time, sorry

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Kunzang Gondu is a completely different cycle. Yes, of course it is related to Khandro Nyinthig, since it, like the Khandro Nyinthig is rooted in the klong gsal nyi ma bar ma rgyud.

But specifically the Khandro Khandro Nyinthig is the terma of Tulku Tsultrim Dorje. The Khandro Yantig is the supplement to this by Longchenpa. Since Peme Lingpa is considered the tulku of Longchenpa, for this reason the Kunzang Gongdu is considered to be a further supplement to teh Khandro Nyinthig -- but it is not the Khandro Nyinthig which is only two volumes long and between the Khandro Nyinthig and Yanthig, there is only one empowerment composed by Longchenpa based on teh root texts of the Khandro Nyinthig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Pero said:

Why do you consider these three to be critical?

Namdrol said:

Please see section 2.8.6 of Precious Vase.

Pero said:

Yes I'm aware of this (it's 2.8.5 and funnily I opened the PV exactly on this page right now haha). However, I never really understood this. Here it almost sounds as if you can't practice anything unless you receive these but that shouldn't be the case since otherwise all those teachings we've received so far would be pointless. So could you shed some light on this?

I see that the Shitro Khorde Rangdrol from Changchub Dorje is also noted as one of those that one should receive if the others aren't an option. Rinpoche is giving it again this year in Merigar...

Malcolm wrote:

In my edition, (1999, 2001) it is 2.8.6.

I suspect that these initiations are the ones that render one suitable to continue in Santi Mahasangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 24th, 2012 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:
Pero said:
Why do you consider these three to be critical?

Malcolm wrote:
Please see section 2.8.6 of Precious Vase.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 10:45 PM
Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions
Content:
Namdrol said:
This is one of the three critical empowerments one can receive. The other two are the Guhyagarbha empowerment and the Khandro Nyinthig empowerment.

Clarence said:
Thanks N-la, as usual! Hope Rinpoche will be able to make it to Poland then. And me too of course.

BTW, which Khandro Nyingthig empowerment do you mean? I thought there are many in the KN. Still want to receive the Nyingthig Yabzhi.

Malcolm wrote:
There is only one empowerment for Khandro Nyinthig.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 10:20 PM
Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions
Content:
Clarence said:
Can someone elaborate on the Tantra please? What is it about? Why would it be good to receive? Etc. etc.

Namdrol said:
It is the root tantra and empowerment of Anuyoga.

Clarence said:
Thanks N-la, so this would be good to receive? I was hoping he would give the Gongpa Zangthal but this sounds very nice as well. Does it have Rigpa'i Tsal Wang?

Malcolm wrote:
This is one of the three critical empowerments one can receive. The other two are the

Guhyagarbha empowerment and the Khandro Nyinthig empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Düpa Do - The Sutra which Gathers All Intentions

Content:

Clarence said:

Can someone elaborate on the Tantra please? What is it about? Why would it be good to receive? Etc. etc.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the root tantra and empowerment of Anuyoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Mind/Rigpa and body relation

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

When i am right informed would Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche have had some teachings from our Yongdzin Rinpoche, no doubt that Rigpa would be used many times in the sense of awareness.....

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever teachings ChNN received from LTN, it is certain they were in Tibetan and not English.

In the end, it does not matter what word you use. If you want to called Rigpa "George" it is also ok, as long as people understand what the word "George" is a symbol for. But if you examine the the range of meanings the word rig pa has in Dzogchen texts, you quickly come to the conclusion it is inappropriate to crib "rig pa" with a single English word. Hence it is better to leave it in Tibetan or backtranslate it into Sanskrit -- hence vidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 23rd, 2012 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: The brain and Dzogchen...

Content:

Andrew108 said:

If ChNN says the brain is like an office then I don't have to accept it as a definitive truth. I

can see it as a relative truth. If ChNN says the brain is appearance/emptiness inseparable then I would accept that as a definitive truth and proceed accordingly.

Namdrol said:

That reason why Norbu Rinpoche says this is because Dzogchen is predicated on an understanding of the human body that founded on medical ideas current in Tibet and India at that time.

In Dzogchen, the rtsal or energy of wisdom, ye shes, is specifically stated to be located in the brain. And the brain is specifically stated to be the organ that coordinates input from the five material sense organs. This is symbolized by the presence of the mandala of the 58 herukas in the brain, just as the eight consciousness are symbolized by the presence of the 42 peaceful deities in the heart.

mzaur said:

I am curious...if this is so, then maybe Dzogchen needs a reboot given current medical ideas? There have been several advances since then

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. For example, the visual cortex located in the brain is responsible for sight on a coarse level. If it is destroyed, you cannot see, even if you have perfectly healthy eyes. If your eyes are destroyed, you cannot see, even if your visual cortex is undamaged. But if even if your sight is impaired, or you have brain damage that blinds you, you will still have dreams in which you have sight. This proves that visual consciousness is not located in the brain, necessarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Huseng said:

Śabda-pramana, knowing through the testimony of an authoritative source, is traditionally an accepted source of knowledge by Buddhists. In this context deferring to the Buddha's word is perfectly acceptable provided we can establish the Buddha as a valid authority. Non-Buddhists will not accept it just as I do not accept the word of the Vedas or Bible as authoritative, but this is a Buddhist forum so I may employ the aforementioned pramana to prove a point.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, that also does not work too well, since for example, if I read a sutra you don't, you will not accept it as an authority. For example, you are not likely to accept the Kulayarāja sūtra, the root text of sems sde in Dzogchen, as authoritative.

So this notion of authority only functions among those who accept the exact same set of texts and hermeneutical criteria for deriving authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: How are teachers like Mangos?

Content:

Sönam said:

I like the term Ripe ... because after a while it becomes Rotten

Sönam

heart said:

That might be true for mango's, not Guru's though. The 4th vision is even better.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

We can consider the fourth vision, the exhaustion of dharmatā, rotten. So indeed a rotten guru is even better than a ripe one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, those instructions are provided for Dzogchen practitioners of the most average caliber so that they can achieve full awakening by taking rebirth in each of the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels for a period of one hundred years each, and attain full awakening within five hundred years, never returning to samsara. This result is attained by doing rushan, actually.

N

Nighthawk said:

Why is it not possible to reach full awakening in only one Buddhafiels?

Malcolm wrote:

Each of the five pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels corresponds to and is an external expression of one of the five wisdoms. For example, Sukhavati is an expression of purified desire i.e. the individually-discriminating wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 3:57 AM

Title: Re: How are teachers like Mangos?

Content:

Paul said:

Could you please name those you consider ripe (or indeed unripe)?

Namdrol said:

Oh, that is easy -- Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche.

As for the rest, people will have to go and check them out on the fruit stand personally.

kirtu said:

The whole of the Tibetan Buddhist world cannot learn just from two, three, four, five teachers even if we only go on a kind of retreat with them once a year.

Malcolm wrote:

I was not making a global statement. Paul asked me who I thought was "ripe", and the context here is Dzogchen masters. I do not know other Dzogchen masters, apart from ones who have passed away. This is not a dis against other teachers.

Dzogchen should be learned from a ripe master. There are very few of those -- meet them while you still have a chance. I just mentioned two.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: How are teachers like Mangos?

Content:

Paul said:

Could you please name those you consider ripe (or indeed unripe)?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, that is easy -- Chogyal Namkhai Norbu and Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche.

As for the rest, people will have to go and check them out on the fruit stand personally.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 2:25 AM

Title: How are teachers like Mangos?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Qualified masters are extremely rare and hard to discern. They are like mangoes.

There are some teachers who look ripe and are ripe; some teachers who look ripe but are not ripe; some teachers who look unripe but are ripe; and some teachers who look unripe and are unripe.

If you find the first type of teacher or the third, fantastic. If you wind up with two or four, good luck.

Make sure your master has a real lineage.

There are many people out there these days who promote themselves as "Dzogchen masters", "tertons", "tulkus" and so on. There are many gullible people in America, etc., and many unethical people who don't mind taking advantage of them.

So be careful.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

In the bone yard said:

Dzogchen requires the pointing out instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct.

But since we are intrinsically endowed with Buddhahood down to the smallest particle of our being, there is no reason to seek rebirth in Sukhavati.

Of course, realizing that and saying are two different things altogether, and the former requires seeking out a qualified master of Dzogchen and following his or her instructions.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

Namdrol said:

The point I was making is that there is no need to do aspirations to be born in Sukhavati, Zangdog Palri and so on if one is really practicing Dzogchen. If not, then, well, mileage varies.

N

Clarence said:

What do you consider really practicing Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

sems sde, klong sde and man ngag sde.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

wisdomfire said:

IMHO, pureland practice should be practised in conjunction with Dzogchen, it is a kind of safe-guard. Also, many enlightened masters went to Sukhavati...

Namdrol said:

Pure land practice is completely unnecessary for Dzogchen practitioners. If someone thinks they need to take rebirth in a pure land, they have not understood one word of Dzogchen.

heart said:

I think no one thinks they "need to" do that. It is not exactly pure land practice but it Jigme Lingpa's Yeshe Lama deals in detail with how to attain rebirth in a pure land, those instructions are for Dzogchen practitioners.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, those instructions are provided for Dzogchen practitioners of the most average caliber so that they can achieve full awakening by taking rebirth in each of the pure nirmanakāya buddhafiels for a period of one hundred years each, and attain full awakening within five hundred years, never returning to samsara. This result is attained by doing rushan, actually.

The point I was making is that there is no need to do aspirations to be born in Sukhavati, Zangdog Palri and so on if one is really practicing Dzogchen. If not, then, well, mileage varies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 21st, 2012 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Amitabha Buddha

Content:

wisdomfire said:

IMHO, pureland practice should be practised in conjunction with Dzogchen, it is a kind of safe-guard. Also, many enlightened masters went to Sukhavati...

Malcolm wrote:

Pure land practice is completely unnecessary for Dzogchen practitioners. If someone thinks they need to take rebirth in a pure land, they have not understood one word of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2012 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

TenzinDorje said:

During teachings on Tsog this last fall, Lama Dawa said a Kapala full of alcohol is allowed each day for a Ngakpa.:

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on how strong it is. A Kapala full of chang is quite weak. A Kapala full of Bacardi 151 would knock most people out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 19th, 2012 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: The permanence of enlightenment

Content:

Leo Rivers said:

...a non-conceptual target is...

Malcolm wrote:

...a contradiction in terms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 9:25 AM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

Prasangas accept transmigration, but they reject that any of the aggregates transmigrates. Svatantrikas assert that consciousness transmigrates.

Prasangas assert that the mistaken imputation "I am" (which is actually a non-existent) appropriates the series of aggregates, generates action, and experiences its results.

As I said, all that transmigrates is delusion.

N

Ogyen said:

not to sound asinine - but what is the consciousness that does not get destroyed then?

I understand it's free of aggregates, clearly these fall apart with the body that dies - but what is stored in the consciousness to move on - the delusion itself?

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness is an aggregate, and conventionally speaking, is momentary. There is no such a thing as a permanent consciousness. Ergo, there is a stream of moments of mind appropriated by the delusion of self-identity, but there is no consciousness, no entity at all that transmigrates per se. The continuum of rebirth is maintained solely by a delusion that appropriates the five aggregates, matter, sensation, perception, formations, and consciousness as a self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Innovation in North American Zen

Content:

Wesley1982 said:

Why can't buddhism be reflected in wearing plain & casual clothing? . .

Malcolm wrote:

It can, but a lot of people like wearing ridiculous clothes. I guess it makes them feel more spritual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 18th, 2012 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

Namdrol said:

The so called "Prasanga" branch of Madhyamaka generally rejects the idea that

consciousness transmigrates.

N

cloudburst said:

What sophistry is this?

Can we expect some terse qualification, or are you actually claiming that Prasangikas do not accept transmigration?

Malcolm wrote:

Prasangas accept transmigration, but they reject that any of the aggregates transmigrates. Svatantrikas assert that consciousness transmigrates.

Prasangas assert that the mistaken imputation "I am" (which is actually a non-existent) appropriates the series of aggregates, generates action, and experiences its results.

As I said, all that transmigrates is delusion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: losing yourself in buddhism

Content:

ryu said:

Hi all,

I often find that i am distracted by the different concepts / ideas and processes of the various schools of buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Tenet systems is a dry hump.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 7:57 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

I take your points Namdrol. Definitely in the Pali sutta's dukkah is explicitly cashed out as -literally - the dis-ease of having aggregates etc.

I have been thinking about it more metaphysically, from an Abhidharmic and Madhyamakan point of view. I suppose there are some interesting distinctions to be made in this respect.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha's approach regarding the 4NT was to introduce an irrefutable experiential fact: everywhere you look there is suffering, because everything and everyone ages, then sickens, then dies. The point is that this is an experiential fact no needs guess at it - everyone knows what suffering means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 10:20 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

I think I mentioned this responding to you in another thread: the state of dukkha gains its formal definition only in relationship to an enduring state of satisfaction (i.e. nirvana). If there was no such enduring satisfaction, then there is no real basis to define intransient bliss as dukkha.

Malcolm wrote:

Bliss in Buddhism is a strictly negative definition i.e. it is the absence of suffering just as health is defined as the absence of illness.

In fact that notion of dukkha and the notion of roga (disease) are intimately related.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 17th, 2012 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

But unless you're presupposing a Buddhist framework, there is no necessity to define these pursuits in the negation. Someone like Bentham would just say: these people are looking for and finding pleasure, and gaining tangible and quantifiable satisfaction from it.

Malcolm wrote:

Pleasure is defined by misery, as satisfaction is defined by dissatisfaction.

tobes said:

The avoidance of suffering would be refraining from visiting your mother-in-law or

walking into a fire.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

tobes said:

So you take the axiomatic Buddhist definition of dukkah - that conditioned pleasure is in reality dukkah because it is conditioned - as a self-evident truth, when really it is a truth claim which stands contrary to many other truth claims.

Malcolm wrote:

The suffering the Buddha was talking about was mental and physical disease and pain i.e. illness, aging and death.

No one can refute that illness is suffering, aging is suffering and death is suffering. That is was the truth of suffering is actually about -- not some rarified middle Indian abhidharma redefinition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: NON-DUALITY

Content:

mindyourmind said:

How does non-duality end suffering? What if the non-dual state is a state of suffering?

Malcolm wrote:

Non-duality does not end suffering. People suffer in the state of non-duality.

What is the state of non-duality [from the Buddhist and Dzogchen POV]? Just the fact that all things arise in dependence and are therefore empty, free from all extremes. There is no non-duality apart from that.

However, by recognizing that we are suffering because we do not perceive the non-dual nature of things, we can reverse that suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, suffering is self-evident.

tobes said:

It's not at all. Suffering is not a good translation for dukkah - because dukkah pertains to why conditioned phenomena are unsatisfactory.

It seems clear to me that most people take it as self-evident that conditioned phenomena are satisfactory. That's why everyone is out driving bmw's, getting pissed, eating chocolate and shagging.

Malcolm wrote:

In the contrary, suffering is a perfectly adequate translation for dukkha. Suffering is self-evident because all actions in which sentient beings engage is aimed at avoiding suffering, for example, driving beamers, getting pissed, eating chocolate and shagging.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, suffering is self-evident.

kirtu said:

Only gross personal suffering is evident for everyone.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

That is sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

Mariusz said:

"The reality is illusion". It is from Svatantrikas, not from Prasangikas. Svatantrikas in India were called "the Centrists who establish illusion through reasoning."

Malcolm wrote:

It is from Nāgārjuna. Chapter 7 MMK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 1:45 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Namdrol said:

At the level of the 4NT, belief does not ever need to enter into it. This is the beauty of the Hīnayāna approach -- one never needs to believe anything. One can decide to experiment with the 4NT as a hypothesis and see if it is correct.

Mahāyāna and other forms of Buddhism (apart from Dzogchen) require more of a metaphysical commitment from the get go.

tobes said:

I think even on the most basic level, a certain amount of belief is required: to experiment with any degree of efficacy, one also has to assume that there is something true or meaningful in the 4NT's.

Malcolm wrote:

No, suffering is self-evident.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

By the way, who give a transmission to Siddharta Gautama?

heart said:

All the other Buddha's.

/magnus

Konchog1 said:

And where did they get it from?

Malcolm wrote:

Other buddhas.

It's buddhas all the way down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

Behind the illusory appearance is the emptiness, and we cannot speak of reality without

emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not real either.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

lucidaromulus said:

i see...thanks for patiently helping me by answering my queries.

is it counted as a downfall or bad karma created if a non initiated person or one who did not receive oral transmission read text that were meant for the initiated?

two cases:

1. it was done not on purpose.(happened to me cause i was so new to tibetan buddhism and it happened to be an ebook which stated in the preface that "please do not read if not empowered", sadly i was so foolish by skipping the preface and read a some of the material. i felt bad but don't know what to do then and now if it happens again.)[and in the past i did not even know which are initiate-only text and which are not. However, lately i've managed to know that all tantra-deity teachings are off limits for me until i am initiated.]

2. if it was done on purpose.(no idea why would someone do that but curiosity might be at fault here.)

Malcolm wrote:

Don't worry, there is no problem.

These everyone reads everything. Of course this gives rise to many misunderstandings, but if someone really wants to understand the meaning of such things they should make an effort to find a qualified teacher who is in a respected lineage.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 16th, 2012 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

lucidaromulus said:

Thank you so much Namdrol for the knowledge

Take the mani mantra for example, personally how would you describe the difference

between receiving oral transmission and not receiving it? that is of course from your experiences...

Malcolm wrote:

If you do not receive transmission you cannot use the Mani as a means personal realization. You can only recite it like a prayer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

lucidaromulus said:

- 1) does that mean the person who received the transmission can transmit it to other people?
- 2) does this oral transmission need to be a formal ceremony?
- 3) if a qualified teacher speaks/chants any sutra or mantra through a microphone, anyone who hears it receives the oral transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

- 1) Not necessarily.
- 2) Not necessarily, no. But of course you have to sit and listen.
- 3) Only if that teacher is intending to give the transmission of that mantra or text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Difference between oral transmission and reading from a book

Content:

lucidaromulus said:

what is the difference between oral transmission and reading from a book?

for example a mantra/sutra, receiving oral transmission from rinpoche/reading from a book.

please enlighten me

Malcolm wrote:

When you receive a lung from a qualified teacher (not just any teacher) you receive a living transmission of energy, the power of the verbal transmission of dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

illusions occur.

- .
- .
- .

Malcolm wrote:

But that does not make them real. Likewise, phenomena occur, but this also does not make them real.

Something real does not need to occur because it has always been real from the beginning.

The problem with most people's understanding of dependent origination is that they actually conceive of dependent origination as "dependence on something else". But you see, Nāgārjuna clearly shows that other dependence (parabhāva) as a merely guise for svabhāva. Things do not derive reality from being dependent anymore than illusions derive reality through being dependent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

It's clearly more than this. It is a state of perfection, a supreme attainment, the basis for transcendental knowledge et al, et al.

One really doesn't have to look too hard in various canons to see that nirvana is doing more work than you want to acknowledge.

Sönam said:

This is because you believe that there is a greater thing than "our real nature" ... but that not the case in buddhism, nirvana is absence of suffering like it is said at the very beginning in the 4NT ...

In fact you do not really trust in Buddha's words.

Sönam

tobes said:

This is precisely my point Sonam: a very critical part of the epistemology of Buddhism is, as you put it, trusting the Buddha's words. To a large extent, the four noble truths and nirvana (whether it is defined in negation or stated more positively) depend upon that.

This does not mean 'blind faith' but nor does it mean 'absolute logical coherence.'

So I'm just saying: it is hypocritical to demand absolute logical coherence for non-Buddhists.

Moreover, where exactly have I stated that I believe in a greater thing than "our real nature?"

Malcolm wrote:

At the level of the 4NT, belief does not ever need to enter into it. This is the beauty of the Hinayāna approach -- one never needs to believe anything. One can decide to experiment with the 4NT as a hypothesis and see if it is correct.

Mahāyāna and other forms of Buddhism (apart from Dzogchen) require more of a metaphysical commitment from the get go.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

It's clearly more than this. It is a state of perfection, a supreme attainment, the basis for transcendental knowledge et al, et al.

One really doesn't have to look too hard in various canons to see that nirvana is doing more work than you want to acknowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, compared to samsara nirvana is perfect since it involves the cessation of suffering and is free from suffering; that cessation of suffering is a supreme attainment, and experiencing the freedom from afflictions is a basis for lokottarajñāna i.e. transcendent wisdom. But in the nirvana is merely state of the absence of further rebirth which given various salutary names; it is merely the state of freedom from afflictions which cause rebirth and that is all. I was not implying that the no effort was involved in removing those affliction mental patterns which sustain rebirth in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

5heaps said:

to call the dependently arisen 'an illusion' instead of 'like an illusion' would be nihilism, since everything was negated in its entirety

Malcolm wrote:

This is mistaken: illusions also depend on causes and conditions to arise, hence whatever arises dependently is illusory. The same mirages, dreams, fire wheels, etc.

When one removes the causes and conditions for an illusion, it vanishes. When one removes the causes and conditions of something dependently originated, it vanishes.

The eight examples of illusion show that the dependently arisen is merely illusory and not real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 10:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

She demands that Buddhist claims must be evidence based and logical. You give her accounts of causality, selflessness and impermanence.

Great, she says. What about nirvana?

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is the absence of a cause for further suffering, and that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 10:41 AM

Title: Re: Lungta

Content:

Konchog1 said:

Is the Three Whites and Sweets and different woods and so forth required for Sang? Or is just incense okay?

Malcolm wrote:

Just incense is ok. If you have opportunity to do more, than it is better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The simple answer would be: the same thing that moves from one moment to the next during the bardo of life.

Tilopa said:

Correct - the continuum of the subtle clear light consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

That would be a tantric perspective (Gelug), but the Prasanga perspective is the one I outlined above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 15th, 2012 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Breaking the one vow

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Out of curiosity what was the vow? If it's ´true private, then of ´course dont tell me.

Ogyen said:

I will not engage in divisive speech.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh well, say you're sorry and move on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

How is it then that we can equate reality with illusion...?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the real cannot be found on analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Lungta

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Then in that case there might be an explanation of the standard use of water for Lungta practices found in one of the following texts for example:

<http://www.lotsawahouse.org/topics/riwo-sangcho> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Malcolm wrote:

In our system, you use an evergreen branch and with it sprinkle water on the flags to purify them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 8:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Ganapuja

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

If we don't have a larger Puja Drum for parts of practices that it compliments, which is the next best scenario:

Malcolm wrote:

Use a bell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

If he valued righteousness so much he would have kept his kingdom. But have you ever heard of a righteous physician?

Namdrol said:

Your statement is a non-sequitar.

maybay said:

One should not try to do the impossible. Have I failed?

Malcolm wrote:

non-sequitar #2

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

If he valued righteousness so much he would have kept his kingdom. But have you ever heard of a righteous physician?

Malcolm wrote:

You statement is a non-sequitar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

Show me a scripture that says reality is an illusion. You will not find it.

DarwidHalim said:

By the way, what is the difference between saying reality is like an illusion and reality is illusion?

Malcolm wrote:

The first is a form of weak realism; the second is the Buddha's view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: What is Kagyae Initiation?! (HH DL)

Content:

heart said:

No, I haven't received the Yeshe Zangtal from ChNNR but since I am not particularly searching for a pure Ati style, it is enough for me if I actually get what I am receiving. Direct introduction, no matter the package, is always completely pure for me.

Namdrol said:

According to ChNN, the idea of a "pure Dzogchen" is a mistake. He also says we need to understand our practice in terms of the unity of the three inner tantras. Dzogchen is how we practice those three inner tantras.

N

Mariusz said:

What about thogal of Dzogchen. Is it in Dzogchen only or is not? Does it mean for practice of thogal Maha and Anu Tantras are somehow necessary?

Malcolm wrote:

There are thogal intimate instructions connected with both mahāyoga and anuyoga cycles. It does not mean that these cycles are necessary in order to do thogal, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 14th, 2012 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Five Mountain Zen Order & Paul Lynch

Content:

Jikan said:

It's a lot easier for the buyer to beware when he or she is better informed of what's going on.

When does public criticism become pissing in the wind?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for example, when it came to attention of the world that James Foster was improperly claiming to be a Tendai Priest, did he stop? No, he just morphed into a "Zen" Priest, and now he is an Ancient Buddha.

So you see, I while I am cynical about the hucksters, snake-oil salesman and racketeers in Buddhism (both Asian and Western), my observation is that they don't stop even when called to account.

Why? Because people are free to rip other people off when it comes to Religion. Religious careers are the sole occupation one can follow where there are no true standards, where one is free to bilk people for millions if one can get away with it. Religion requires very little capital startup, almost no training at all, and a reasonably articulate and amoral person or otherwise self-deluded person, can get people to go along with one's spiel and charge them good money for it.

So this is why it is just pissing in the wind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

Huseng said:

This is one perspective. Vasubandhu had a different idea (see 18a-d):

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu's perspective is vastly inferior to that of Nāgārjuna in my opinion.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nope, these are very clear. "the five aggregates are illusory. They do not exist" could not be clearer. The meaning of the illusion metaphor is very clear and is summed up in the tibetan term med par gsal snang i.e. clearly apparent non-existent.

Malcolm wrote:
Not at all.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 10:06 PM
Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth
Content:

Huseng said:

Collectively it is the mental aggregates, which are a dependently-originated karmic reaction fundamentally driven by ignorance of reality (hence subject to perishing), that are reborn. There is no "self" in a concrete sense, but there is a reaction between causes and conditions which leads to the continued existence of a sentient being.

In explaining such things a general audience it is best just to say the mind is reborn. The mind, however, is not absolute either and is dependently originated just as much as a physical body is.

Malcolm wrote:
Nagāgarjuna opines:

Although the aggregates are serially connected,
the wise are to comprehend nothing has transmigrated
In that respect, the aggregates are the aggregates of matter, sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness. Those are termed 'serially connected'. Not having ceased, they produce another produced from that cause. Nevertheless, not even a subtle particle of an existent has transmigrated from this world to the next. That being the case, the wheel of samsara is created by the traces of erroneous concepts.

The so called "Prasanga" branch of Madhyamaka generally rejects the idea that consciousness transmigrates.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 9:11 PM
Title: Re: What is Kagyae Initiation?! (HH DL)
Content:

heart said:

No, I haven't received the Yeshe Zangtal from ChNNR but since I am not particularly searching for a pure Ati style, it is enough for me if I actually get what I am receiving. Direct introduction, no matter the package, is always completely pure for me.

Malcolm wrote:

According to ChNN, the idea of a "pure Dzogchen" is a mistake. He also says we need to understand our practice in terms of the unity of the three inner tantras. Dzogchen is how we practice those three inner tantras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Five Mountain Zen Order & Paul Lynch

Content:

jisahn108 said:

Astus, clearly you aren't going to meet me on this. You seem to think Dharma is maybe about stringing a logical series of words together in a convincing fashion, and sort of doing what you want as long as you can convince yourself that theoretically in the end it's skillful means? This isn't about a single claim being true or not. This isn't some vague hypothetical. Again - Zen teaching primarily consists of modeled and embodied behavior, not nice words. By this measure, Paul Lynch's teaching largely consists of inflation, distortion, manipulation, disrespect, outright lying, and a total lack of integrity, at a number of levels. In other words, not very Zen at all.

Please don't bother with more theoretical possibilities or historical examples. I can do that for myself, thanks. Our takes are on the table.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that all your complaining amounts to pissing in the wind, right? This issue is not confined to Zen/Chan/Son. Buddhism is rife with frauds, grifters and charlatons. That is just how it is. Caveat emptor. And the sad thing is that I observe that money is the thing which drives it all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

The fact that someone could eventually mistake the Base for God doesn't make them the same.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it remains like the jaundiced view of a conch shell or a white cloth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

Show me a scripture that says reality is an illusion. You will not find it.

Namdrol said:

Because of dwelling in the equivalence of all phenomena with illusions, mirages, dreams, water moons, echoes and double vision, the Dharma free of affliction is perfectly realized.

-- ārya-lalitavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Further, sister, the five aggregates are illusory. They do not exist. There is no arising of erroneous action. It is conventionally designated through an error. Sister, awakening is like an illusion, it does not exist, it is conventionally designated through an error. Sister, though awakening is like an illusion, it does not exist, it is conventionally designated through an error. Therefore, sister, because illusions are the same, the aggregates are the same. Because the aggregates are the same, illusion is the same. Since illusion is the same, awakening is the same. Since awakening is the same, illusion is the same. Sister, therefore, I call you "awakened".

-- ārya-mañjuśrīvikurvāṇaparivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

maybay said:

The search continues...

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, these are very clear. "the five aggregates are illusory. They do not exist" could not be clearer. The meaning of the illusion metaphor is very clear and is summed up in the tibetan term med par gsal snang i.e. clearly apparent non-existent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Prima facie, of course. But if you dig a little deeper, the story is far more complex.

For starters, svabava is not precisely commensurable with what is meant by essence in some western contexts. And what is meant by essence differs markedly in different thinkers and traditions.

Namdrol said:

Notions of essence boil down to the Paramedian distinction between being and non-being, as far as western philosophy goes.

At base, apart from Madhyamaka, all of these different schools are asserting some sort of being contrasted with some sort of non-being.

This is why everyone apart from Madhyamaka is considered realist in some sense or another.

N

tobes said:

That's an incredibly reductive and misleading account of western philosophy.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, given that I was raised by a professor of philosophy, I am entitled to be incredibly reductive about it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 12:48 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Prima facie, of course. But if you dig a little deeper, the story is far more complex.

For starters, svabava is not precisely commensurable with what is meant by essence in some western contexts. And what is meant by essence differs markedly in different thinkers and traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Notions of essence boil down to the Paramedian distinction between being and non-being, as far as western philosophy goes.

At base, apart from Madhyamaka, all of these different schools are asserting some sort of being contrasted with some sort of non-being.

This is why everyone apart from Madhyamaka is considered realist in some sense or another.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 12:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Because I don't think anyone has done this yet. There's barely been a published paper on these kinds of topics.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not necessary. All theistic views, especially in ancient Philosophy boil down to essentialism. Madhyamaka rejects that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 12:27 PM

Title: Re: What is the concept of "reality" in Buddhism?

Content:

maybay said:

Show me a scripture that says reality is an illusion. You will not find it.

Malcolm wrote:

Because of dwelling in the equivalence of all phenomena with illusions, mirages, dreams, water moons, echoes and double vision, the Dharma free of affliction is perfectly realized.

-- ārya-lalitavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Further, sister, the five aggregates are illusory. They do not exist. There is no arising of erroneous action. It is conventionally designated through an error. Sister, awakening is like an illusion, it does not exist, it is conventionally designated through an error. Sister, though awakening is like an illusion, it does not exist, it is conventionally designated through an error. Therefore, sister, because illusions are the same, the aggregates are the same. Because the aggregates are the same, illusion is the same. Since illusion is the same, awakening is the same. Since awakening is the same, illusion is the same. Sister, therefore, I call you "awakened".

-- ārya-mañjuśrīvikurvāṇaparivarta-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:48 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Mint, Dechen Norbu, did you guys happen to hear Rinpoche's teaching on the last day of the recent retreat?

<http://www.freezecast.com/replay/index.php> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

He addressed the very topic that you two are debating (in context of course).

Malcolm wrote:

Not really -- what he said was is that it was possible to frame "God" as a signifier for one's primordial potentiality (i.e. the basis), but he did not state that this was how theistic traditions would understand it nor that they would accept it in this way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:45 AM

Title: Re: Question about "what moves on" in rebirth

Content:

Ogyen said:

I do NOT want to hash out a whole argument on rebirth. I have often been asked this one question that I honestly don't know how to answer because I'm not qualified, but it has been bugging me now for some time. According to my own studies (Nyingma tradition) there is no solid 'self' thing or anything to call a 'soul.' So when I'm asked about 'reincarnation' by non-buddhists I flat out deny it, "Buddhism does not ascribe to 'reincarnation'" then they say, "What about rebirth" at which point I just say I'm not qualified to speak on the matter-because I'm not. I'm a newb. It's good practice for reducing self-importance to look like an dolt on a regular basis in showing you don't know something. In my studies I've come to understand that there is nothing to 'reincarnate' - however the issue is complex because of the 12 links of DO we have ignorance as the cause and desire and nama and rupa etc etc, so something continues to grasp for form, for being...

I beg our members here to please NOT make this into a thread about rebirth's validity or not (as threads around this questions often degenerate and polarize), I'm not interested in that - in this sense, I have no questions around validity, in practice i just want to understand what is being asked and perhaps gain better insight myself in terms of "what moves on" into new form in rebirth - and how the cycle goes on and on... Is it the deepest part of consciousness (alaya)? What is it in me that will continue to grasp with desire out of ignorance into new form and find new ways to compound new karma?

Malcolm wrote:

Delusion and nothing more, that is what "moves". Which delusion? The delusion "I am".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 11:44 AM

Title: Re: Breaking the one vow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Vows work like this -- when you break them, the break only lasts for a single day. You confess, and you move on with your life.

N

Ogyen said:

I have hit a brick wall - everywhere I look the filters of gloom cover my sight, a nasty negative energy shrouds my outlook despite keeping at it and doing everything I know (and that list is fairly extensive having years of practice working with the goggles of depression and the afflictions of mental stress). My head knows it's just filters, tricks of perception, nothing to even dive too deep into - I watch the clouds like storms come and go.. I even sense very keenly some days there is no 'me' to get all bent out of shape and I let much of it rise and fall away without 'acting/reacting' to the whole cycle... but the one thing I'm least proud of that I did was break the one vow I made to my teacher when I took refuge. He made me pick one of the 10 that I vowed and said, "This is the one that you vow to never do, the one that you vow to me." And I picked. I don't know why I picked that one. I even felt I didn't know if I could always keep it no matter what. And in the lowest of lowest, I broke it. I feel like the biggest phony ever. I probably am - I mean I don't even pretend to try to be Buddhist... even that is a construct. I feel like either I embody a Buddha or shut up kid - don't pretend or try to be anything. There is no try, either do or don't -and watch yourself doing or not doing. Meanwhile, I FEEL the suffering. Intensely. And no relief is coming.

What are the consequences of breaking one's vow to one's teacher? I imagine pretty dire...?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Then if we choose between combining Sang & Serkyem with a Tun or a Ganapuja, it would be better to choose combining it with a Thun practice?

Thanks again.

Malcolm wrote:

I think so. Ganapuja already has many offerings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Thank you Namdrol.

I wasn't thinking of actually combining Sang & Serkyem with a Tun or Ganapuja (was referring to doing them in sequence rather); but if we can do that, then I'd like to combine the practice with Thun or Ganapuja.

So let's say for example we combine Sang & Serkyem with a long Ganapuja; would we begin it right after the Offerings to the Guardians, right after the Invocations to the Guardians, or right after the Naggon or Ngagkong for the Guardians?

Also, if we are to offer milk-tea and red wine, we would mix them together in the upper Serkyem cup then?

Malcolm wrote:

generally you would not combined with ganapuja. But if you did, after ngaggong.

You offer the three drinks seperately.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 7:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Adamantine said:

Something I have a habit of doing when offering to the dharmapalas is filling a serkyem with offering substances, as the support torma. Is this considered acceptable, or complimentary to do in the context of a DC Tun or Ganapuja? I don't recall ever seeing a physical support offered to the protectors in any DC event I've been to, or Rinpoche ever mentioning it, so it clearly doesn't seem to be a requirement, -but is it acceptable to include if one likes and has the proper materials?

heart said:

In ChNNR book Sang offering and Serkyem for the eight classes he mention clearly how to us the serkyem and what to put in it

http://shangshung.org/store/index.php?main_page=product_info&products_id=280

Lhug-Pa said:

When offering Sang & Serkyem is it generally acceptable—when finished—to go straight into a Long Life practice or Ganapuja and to leave the Serkyem on the Shrine with its contents? If this is not acceptable, can we then just set the Serkyem aside somewhere in the Shrine room until the Ganapuja is finished?

And I take it that milk-tea can go in the lower basin of the Serkyem and red wine in the top offering cup of the same Serkyem?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally Sang and Serkyme are done alone --but if combining with Thun practices then they are done after the protectors.

When doing it by yourself, you only need wine. And no, tea, milk and wine go into the serkyem cup. The basin is to catch excess. Some people also put food in the basin. There are differing customs.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

The institution of "Buddhism" has many provided many unprovables. People born out of lotus flowers and so on.

This cannot be denied.

But believing in them is not essential. it is not demanded of the follower.

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on which school or teacher you follow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 13th, 2012 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Five Mountain Zen Order & Paul Lynch

Content:

jisahn108 said:

Personally, he gives me dharmic heartburn.

Malcolm wrote:

It is good stop eating foods that give you heartburn.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Author of Lujin

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

So you're saying the Lujin was initially compiled by Karma Chagme from the works of the III Karmapa and then further edited by the XIV Karmapa and Jamgon Kongtrul. So the original compiler is Karma Chagme but the version we use today in the Karma Kagyu is probably that of Jamgon Kongtrul Lodro Thaye?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. And very likely, Karma Chagme was not the original compiler.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Author of Lujin

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

I have seen the text of the Kagyu daily Chod practice or Lujin variously attributed to the XIV Karmapa Thekchok Dorje (Lama Lodo), Karma Chakme (Sarah Harding) or Lodro Thaye (Tenga Rinpoche). I understand that a lot of it is compiled from the work of the III Karmapa Rangjung Dorje but who was the actual author/compiler? Anyone know?

Malcolm wrote:

All of them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

tobes said:

Do you really think most neo-Buddhists are prepared to accept their position as mere ideology?

Malcolm wrote:

They will make faster progress if they do.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 12th, 2012 at 7:04 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:

tobes said:

However, what worries me, is that this epistemological double standard leaves neo-Buddhism open to the charge that it is functioning more or less as an ideology.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. That is the Dzogchen critique of the nine yanas, i.e., that they are ideologies.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 11:19 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:

Nighthawk said:

The Dzogchen view that all sentient beings will become Buddhas at the end of this aeon regardless if they have practiced the Dharma or not doesn't really make much sense at all.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the Dzogchen view.

The Dzogchen view is that all sentient beings will become Buddhas by the end of the eon because they will all meet Dzogchen teachings and practice them.

Nighthawk said:

And then these Buddhas are said to revert back to the "basis" in other words ignorance, but how can a Buddha ever revert back to that? If a Buddha will revert back to ignorance then he is not really a Buddha so why even label them as that?

Malcolm wrote:

Here, the usage "buddha" is not precise. It means those who have gained some measure of realization i.e. bodhi, but not necessarily annutara samyak sambodhi.

Also revert to the basis does not mean reverting to ignorance. There is no ignorance in the basis.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Astrological "overlap" with others?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Rinpoche wrote that traditionally we are to consider ourselves already a year old when we were born, so when the calendar and the consulting-the-calendar-book say to calculate specific things according to "when we were born" does this always come with the assumption that we should always consider that our animal and element are the ones that are actually of a year before our actual date of birth?

Malcolm wrote:

Never. If you are born in a Dragon year, you are one when you are born, are a dragon, and turn 2 at the next new year, even if you are born the day before the Tibetan new year of the following year.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 7:00 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

steveb1 said:

That's really interesting. Not to tax the point, does this Buddha of the present eon have a name - I presume it was not Shakyamuni because other Buddhas preceded him?

Namdrol said:

Samantabhadra.

Nighthawk said:

Where did this idea originate from the Adi Buddha is the "Primordial" Buddha rather than the first Buddha of this aeon? Is it perhaps a mistranslation from Tibetan texts or the teaching of a different Tibetan school(s)?

Malcolm wrote:

Misunderstanding of early western scholars.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

steveb1 said:

That's really interesting. Not to tax the point, does this Buddha of the present eon have a name - I presume it was not Shakyamuni because other Buddhas preceded him?

Malcolm wrote:
Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 11th, 2012 at 3:39 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism on God
Content:

freefromsamsara said:
How do you know the Lord Creator isn't the same being as Adi Buddha in buddhist cosmology?

Namdrol said:
Because the Adibuddha is not a creator.

steveb1 said:
Could someone please expand on this ... ?

I did not find much on Abi Buddha when I did a Google search, except that Abi Buddha is a primordial Buddha from whom things flow in an "emanationist" manner. Granted that this is accurate, and that emanation is not the same as creation, still: what is the essential difference ... ? If Abi Buddha is not a "sky father"-type creator, but still "He" is an emanator, then is "He" not involved in the origination of universes and the structure of physical processes ... ? But if that is true, how is that a Buddha would emanate a samsaric world full of ignorance and suffering ... ?

Malcolm wrote:
Because "Adi" means first, and really refers to the first Buddha of the present eon, the first Buddha who woke up.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 10:20 PM
Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves
Content:

Dechen Norbu said:
Really Magnus? I never noticed that...
I never understood him to see shamatha as the experience of emptiness.

Namdrol said:
ChNN frequently says this actually, but he does not mean realization of emptiness free from extremes, he means an experience where the mind is empty of thought.

heart said:

Like non-thought as in bliss, clarity and non-thought? He actually means something like non-conceptual?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

mzaur said:

Does anyone know what the topic will be for the NY retreat? I could not find any info here

<http://tsegyalgar.org/localcenters/kundrolling/kundrollingevents/retreatwithchoegya3/>
" onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Most likely a general retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Namdrol said:

The experience of emptiness here is a Vajrayāna description.

mzaur said:

Ah, I see. So what does Vajrayana call the insight into Pratītyasamutpāda?

Malcolm wrote:

Realization of emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

heart said:

I always found it quite confusing that ChNNR seems to equate shamata and emptiness.

/magnus

mzaur said:

Ah, so that's it. Sonam's quote was indeed confusing...Rinpoche isn't talking about Pratītyasamutpāda (dependent origination) when he says shunyata/emptiness... so what does Rinpoche call dependent origination then?

It does seem that many people, especially non-Buddhists but also Buddhists too, talk about emptiness as a state of mind free from thought, perhaps because the word emptiness does seem to point to that experience [although of course shunyata does not mean that]. It does seem skillful for Rinpoche to accept that definition and use it.

Malcolm wrote:

The experience of emptiness here is a Vajrayāna description.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

That's how I take it. But never really noticed him equating with shamatha.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he does. I have heard him say this many times over the years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Really Magnus? I never noticed that...

I never understood him to see shamatha as the experience of emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN frequently says this actually, but he does not mean realization of emptiness free from extremes, he means an experience where the mind is empty of thought.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

heart said:

I always found it quite confusing that ChNNR seems to equate shamata and emptiness.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

He isn't. I used to find this confusing too until I came across a passage by Sachen Kunga Nyingpo where he described the experience of the gap between two thoughts as being an experience of emptiness i.e. an experience of absence of thoughts.

But ChNN does not mean that this experience of emptiness is emptiness qua emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism on God

Content:

freefromsamsara said:

How do you know the Lord Creator isn't the same being as Adi Buddha in buddhist cosmology?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the Adibuddha is not a creator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

mzaur said:

but what's stopping Zen practitioners from realizing that also?

Malcolm wrote:

Lack of intimate instructions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Untill now i know only the sexual abuse related to karma mudra but there must be more like for instance the money shuffle side of town which is based on a certain Sangha power.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two main things: sexual misconduct and misusing the money of students for

personal gain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Are Dharmapalas Necessary ?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

Thank you - not the first time you have clarified for me the position vis a vis Yidam and Dharmapala forms.

I was misled by a footnote here, amongst other sources, regarding Hayagriva as a Dharmapala:

<http://www.rinpoche.com/teachings/darmapalas.htm> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Note 6: The eight Dharmapalas are Mahakala, Palden Lhamo, Yamantaka, Kubera, Hayagriva, Changpa, Yama, and Begtse.

Certainly in the recent Nyenpa Lha Sum empowerment with Dzogchen Rinpoche all three deities were Yidams - Hayagriva (Padmanta Trita), Vajrapani and Garuda. Yet all three are Antidote Deities which remove obstructions, and assist in dealing with illnesses and spirit harm.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this is a "lesser" form of Hayagriva. But also Hayagriva/Vajravārāhi is the central deity of many Anuyoga cycles connected with Dzogchen such as the Khandro Nyinthig.

If you have received any transmissions from Ch. Namkhai Norbu, the Guru Dragphur is a combination deity of Guru Dragpo, Yangdag Heruka, Vajrakilaya, Vajrapani, Hayagriva and Garuda.

Guru Dragpo is Padmasambhava. Yangdag Heruka was his main practice. He realized the level of a mahamudra vidyādhara through practicing Vajrakilaya. And then of course, Vajrapani is for controlling celestial negative forces; Hayagriva is for controlling terrestrial negative forces, and Garuda is for controlling subterranean negative forces.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Are Dharmapalas Necessary ?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

In terms of the broad topic, the fact that Mahakala and others appear as both Yidams and Dharmapalas would denote some necessity, so precisely what is it that the Dharmapala Mahakala can do that the Yidam Mahakala cannot? Would it be that the answer is simply in the way we regard the deity rather than a material difference between the two forms, i.e. using the same tool for two different purposes?

.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what kind of empowerment you receive.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 10th, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Are Dharmapalas Necessary ?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

A second point I would make is that in practice we self-generate as a Yidam, but never as a Protector as far as I know.

Namdrol said:

Mahākala and Mahākali are both Yidams as well as Dharmapālas.

The practice of Mahākala as a Yidam is quite widespread in Sakya, actually. It is also widespread in Kagyu and Nyingma.

N

Blue Garuda said:

Yes, I believe that Hayagriva is similarly regarded as Yidam and Dharmapala within Nyingma.

Malcolm wrote:

Hayagriva is only a Yidam.

Blue Garuda said:

To choose one example, does the practitioner self-generate as the Dharmapala Mahakala or only as the Yidam Mahakala?

Malcolm wrote:

Only as Yidam in the Yidam practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 9th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Are Dharmapalas Necessary ?

Content:

Blue Garuda said:

A second point I would make is that in practice we self-generate as a Yidam, but never as a Protector as far as I know.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahākala and Mahākali are both Yidams as well as Dharmapālas.

The practice of Mahākala as a Yidam is quite widespread in Sakya, actually. It is also widespread in Kagyu and Nyingma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 9th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

Yontan said:

Agreed.

Longchenpa has done his best to give us a leg up. I believe his Resting at Ease trilogy has good info. Paltrul's seminal ngondro text has good help as well. At the least a teacher's students should show some bodhicitta, but even that can be hard to discern when first starting out.

I suppose it all comes down to karma. Best to pray to the bodhisattvas for guidance.

Malcolm wrote:

There is not such thing as a teacher whose conduct is immune to reproach. Buddhsit tantras warn again and again about the necessity to pick a qualified Guru.

Unacceptable conduct in teachers is not the kind of thing one can necessarily predict in the beginning of a teacher/student relationship, and erudition, even the appearance of bodhicitta, will not prevent such people from engaging in completely unacceptable conduct.

When you discover unacceptable conduct in some "teacher" like this, you have no choice but to separate yourself from that person, as Kongtrul makes very clear.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 9th, 2012 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- How can a beginner have a knowledge about the truly qualified Dzogchenpa Master?

Malcolm wrote:

Admittedly this is a difficult issue.

kalden yungdrung said:

- This does count also in choosing as a beginner, a Tantric Master.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, difficult.

kalden yungdrung said:

So it seems to be nearly impossible to make a correct choice as a beginner, so good karma and to have built up in previous lives a connection / base, would be important..... Maybe I did forget something

Malcolm wrote:

It is difficult even when one is not a beginner. Sometimes people make errors of judgement, and someone they thought was a qualified to give teachings turns out not to be qualified at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 9th, 2012 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

pemachophel said:

I offer this as a caveat against simply reading the available Dzogchen literature in English, thinking that one has understood the natural state, and then traveling down a wrong path.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen texts are manuals, not literature, and need to be understood in that way.

They need to be studied in conjunction with a teacher, until one's understanding is comprehensive and moving in the right direction. If one is studying with someone who does not have an actual understanding of Dzogchen but merely uses Dzogchen as a way attracting students in order to make a living, this can also interfere with a student's progress. So it is important to make sure that one's teacher of Dzogchen is a truly qualified teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: The Buddha Witinin by Jamgon Kontrul

Content:

Jax said:

Jean Luc, who I know well, would agree with "knowledge" for Rigpa. As they both think rigpa is some kind of knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

So in fact does my Guru, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu -- in fact he said so again just last night. "Rigpa is not the basis, the basis is called bodhicitta; rigpa is one's knowledge of that basis and the ability to remain in that knowledge."

It is also true that ChNN translates rig pa as instant presence. The term rigpa gets used in a variety of ways in Dzogchen texts, which is why Vimalamitra articulated five different forms of rigpa.

As for awareness, that bests translates shes pa as in thamal gyi shes pa i.e. ordinary awareness or ma bcos shes pa skad cig ma, momentary unfabricated awareness, etc. Sometimes shes pa means "to understand" when used as a verb. In other contexts it is better to translate shes pa as cognition, and so on. Tibetan is a language that is very synonym poor, so the same words have to do a lot of work in many different contexts.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

Then I learned how much many "masters" were not realized. They knew the spiel but had no profound realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Care to list any masters you think are realized?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

You moron, I explained it in exact detail. Ok, ok... You are a bit slow, I get it.

Mr. G said:

Couldn't even keep it under control after being given a second chance, huh? ::sigh::

Malcolm wrote:

It's ok. I provoked him into on purpose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

Mental constructions cannot be said to exist or not exist as they are beyond both extremes.

Malcolm wrote:

We were not discussing the emptiness of mental constructs, but rather, how they come about. You have not provided an adequate response.

No worries. I did not imagine you could.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 10:16 AM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

No belief necessary Nam... Doubt is just distraction." Feel the Force Luke... You can't know it with your intellect". Just having fun with you Nam(or is it Malcolm?)

Malcolm wrote:

Either Malcolm or Namdrol.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: The Buddha Witinin by Jamgon Kontrul

Content:

Jax said:

Your translation is being influenced by the conceptualized vidya as used in all sorts of (gelugpa) translations.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm no, it is being influenced by the title of numerous dzogchen tantras where vidyā is translated as rig pa. Two upadesha tantras bear the term vidyā for rigpa in their Sanskrit titles, as well as many other titles of tantras. For example, in the dgongs pa zang thal, there is a text entitled the cittavidyā praveśa tantra or in Tibetan sems dang rig pa dbye ba'i rgyud or in English the The Tantra of Distinguishing Mind (citta) and Vidyā (rigpa).

These days there is a movement to just leave the term rigpa in Tibetan. I prefer vidyā because we commonly use terms like dharmakāya, etc.

But your assertion that there is no term for rig pa in Sanskrit is truly humorous and completely false. Saying such things just makes you look like a fool.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 10:02 AM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

No Namdrol,"sentient beings" are just a mental construction arising within the space of the Dharmakaya, like reflections in a mirror.

Namdrol said:

How do those those mental constructions come about according to you (I am perfectly familiar with what Dzogchen texts say)? Do mental constructions merely arise from themselves without a cause, or do they have a cause?

Jax said:

Mental constructions arise as the radiance of the ground, Zhi. They are an evolution of the Five Lights as tsal and rolpa, as an arising consciousness evolves it is bewildered by the display of the Five Lights, of which it is a part. Seeing the display as "other", subject and object are established. From this a false dichotomy arises in which all aspects of sem arise.

Malcolm wrote:

So you have retreated from your assertion that there are no "sems can" i.e. possessors of sem i.e. sentient beings.

Jax said:

But in fact nothing was "caused" because an "effect" never attained to the status of becoming an independently existing entity.

Malcolm wrote:

Independently existing entities do not require causes or conditions so your statement here is a non-sequiter.

Jax said:

Although a sentient being may be said to exist conventionally...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they may. Good to see you grasp this fact.

Still, there are two things: one you have not explained how an arising consciousness evolves, nor have you given a reason why this happens. So you have not answered the question of whether these mental constructions are independently existent entities since they arise from themselves and lack causes, or are caused entities that lack independent existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

You are exactly right Namdrol, I have no "idea" what Rigpa is. There you have it, I came clean man. And I also know, you have only "ideas" about what Rigpa is. I have never been able to capture Rigpa as an idea.

Malcolm wrote:

We have seen you over and over again proclaim your qualities of realization and understanding. We just don't believe you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: The Buddha Witinin by Jamgon Kontrul

Content:

Jax said:

Wow! Thank you Namdrol! I never considered myself an intellectual, but coming from you that has weight.

Malcolm wrote:

It's not a compliment.

Jax said:

Then you too can teach others from insight not just dry, literal parroting of others teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

That's funny, coming from you.

Jax said:

But you got stuck there because you try to translate Rigpa from the nuance of Sanskrit "vidya".

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, if you were less of an intellectual you would understand that vidyā is the word that Tibetans translate as "rig pa". For example, the Tantra Of The Great Self-liberated Vidyā That Unravels All is translated into Tibetan as the rig pa rang grol chen po thams cad 'grol ba'i rgyud from the Sanskrit Mahā vidyā svamukti sarva ghadita tantra

Jax said:

Sanskrit had no word for Rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Your ignorance is astonishing.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 8:29 AM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

Cap'n, ask around to people who had either large retreat "direct introduction" or webcast. Ask them if they experienced the non-dual Rigpa. In Tibet the populace came to Dzogchen masters for a "blessing", they weren't seriously engaged as practitioners (per Norbu). Real practitioners met in private for the Tsal Wang and other forms of "direct introduction". You need almost daily contact with a teacher until the retreat practice is completed as well as afterward. I know many people, for many years... As Tenzin Wangyal said "only about 1% of disciples will recognize actual rigpa". To me that is unacceptable, it's not that difficult when one on one instruction is available easily, lineage or not. Senior students have the same capacity if they have really "recognized".

Malcolm wrote:

Jax, you have no idea what rigpa is. Just admit it, come clean man.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:21 AM
Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa
Content:
samdrup said:
Jax, I'm beginning to think you're taking the piss.

Malcolm wrote:
It's been obvious for a while, but he also charges money for it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:15 AM
Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote
Content:
Jax said:
Nam, Nubs was wrong. He didn't realize that Chan realization is Mahamudra and trekchod, realizing kadag. Boy, you don't read my posts. I explained that earlier.

Malcolm wrote:
Realization of Chan, Mahāmudra, and Dzogchen are all the same. The length of time it takes to gain that realization is what makes the distinction.

Your concept of ka dag is a bit limited though. Kadag is not simply emptiness, though it has been dumbed down in that way for people like you.

Jax said:
Nubs should have stayed within his own knowledge base.

Malcolm wrote:
Nonsense, Nubchen had personal experience of Chan.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:13 AM
Title: Re: The Buddha Witin in by Jamgon Kontrul
Content:
Jax said:
Try to "recognize" Rinpoche's intent and meaning.. If you do, that's transmission of the best kind.

Malcolm wrote:
Your problem, Jax, and the reason why your teachings are complete shite, is that you are an intellectual. Not a particularly skillful one, nor especially articulate, but an intellectual nevertheless.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

Nam, only my intestines...

Malcolm wrote:

No, completely and utterly, head to toe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Jamgon Kongtrul Rinpoche Quote

Content:

Jax said:

Tom... Yes, at least some balance. It seems there is similarity between some positions here as expressed in "The Great Debate" at Samye in Tibet in the 800's (if it actually occurred!). The debate centered between the "sudden" or "all at once school" of the Chan school and the "gradual approach" of Kamalasila.

Malcolm wrote:

This solely concerned sutrayāna teachings and had nothing to do with Varjayāna. In his seminal Lamp of the Eye of Concentration, Nubchen clarifies that even though Mahāyoga is "gradual" is still superior to Chan because of the presence of introduction in Mahāyoga and its absence in Chan. Of course, Dzogchen is yet again superior to Mahāyoga, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

I most often write from that Space.

Malcolm wrote:

You, Jax, are completely and entirely full of shit, in my not so humble opinion of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 8th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

No Namdrol, "sentient beings" are just a mental construction arising within the space of the Dharmakaya, like reflections in a mirror.

Malcolm wrote:

How do those those mental constructions come about according to you (I am perfectly familiar with what Dzogchen texts say)? Do mental constructions merely arise from themselves without a cause, or do they have a cause?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Peter Fenner - "Radiant Mind"

Content:

spanda said:

What do you think? Another attempt to "adapt" Dzogchen teachings to the westerners?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

Dechen please hang in here with me a second. There is no one who attains or maintains the natural state or rigpa. There is no entity to rest in the natural state. The one who would recognize or rest is just the assembly of five skandhas, sem. The skandhas are arisings in that uncaused Dharmakaya, who you are. There is no self to realize Rigpa, that's a contradiction of terms.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no self to realize period in Dharma as a whole. Again, this is simple sutrayāna 101 stuff.

Jax said:

It's not that there is nothing "to do", but rather there is no one to do it.

Malcolm wrote:

So far you have shared nothing with us from Dzogchen teachings themselves. You have

just shared a bunch of sutrayāna perspectives. The idea that there is really nothing to introduce is Sakyapa and Gelug idea, one the ChNN regularly laughs at. In Dzogchen there is something to introduce.

Your problem is that you are still hung up on the relative/ultimate dichotomy like a first year Zen student.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

What happened to "nyamnyid" as same taste wherein all appearances are equal in value?

Malcolm wrote:

All appearances are equal in value.

But when people are not properly taught, they are cut off from the possibility of realization and that is an abomination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

Good answer Namdrol, but perhaps it would be more precise to say the only true refuge is one's own indestructible and changeless Nature as the Dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if you want to go the Sutrayāna route, you might say this.

Still, Primordial Buddhahood is useless if it does not lessen your faults.

Nevertheless, if one does not practice, one will not realize anything and one will just remain an ordinary afflicted sentient being.

You do accept that there are such things, no matter how illusory, correct?

And you do accept you are one, correct?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:39 PM

Title: Re: Seek To Be Lamps Unto Yourselves

Content:

Jax said:

We find a slightly different rendering in the Pali Mahāparinibbāna Sutta where it says: "Therefore, Ānanda, be islands unto yourselves, refuges unto yourselves, seeking no external refuge; with the Dhamma as your island, the Dhamma as your refuge, seeking no other refuge. (Tr. vipassana.com)

Tasmātihānanda, attadīpā viharatha attasaranā anaññasaranā, dhammadīpā dhammasaranā anaññasaranā.

How does this injunction from the Buddha square with Vajrayana in general?

Malcolm wrote:

The only true refuge one has is one's own practice of Dharma. Ultimately there is no other refuge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:36 PM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

"Even the thought that freedom comes about through direct introduction is deluded.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the basis is always intrinsically liberated.

Jax said:

One strives to free this essence from whatever binds it, but nothing need be done to free it, for unobstructed Awareness, which has never existed as anything whatsoever, does not entail any duality of something to be realized and someone to realize it.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, since the basis is always intrinsically liberated.

Jax said:

What can be shown at this point is the transcendence of view and meditation, in which nothing need be done regarding realization, nothing need be directly introduced, and no state of meditation need be cultivated. So there is the expression 'it is irrelevant whether or not one has realization'."

Malcolm wrote:

This is where you deviate in your understanding. The Tibetan text does not use the term "need". It says quite simply:

"Here, since it is demonstrated there is nothing to be realized, nothing introduced, beyond view and meditation, it is called "beyond realization and non-realization".

But the context of the sentence above is provided in the previous sentence:
"Because an object to realize is not established since that ultimate dharmatā is beyond mind, a so called "realization" in the relative is described to be solely a deluded concept."

This passage is not saying that introduction is unnecessary. It is saying that from the ultimate point of view, there is nothing to introduce. But from an ultimate point of view not only are there no sentient beings, there are also no buddhas. This point of view is not especially profound. Even the Perfection of Wisdom sutras makes this point. So what?

Longchenpa is not saying that introduction is unnecessary. The context of this statement in general, in terms of the commentary as whole, comes after his description of the two types of transference, those of best capacity and those of medium capacity. Following this, he moves into a description of why Ati is considered unreasonable by those in lower vehicles since Ati is beyond cause and result.

But nevertheless, this does not mean that he considers introduction unnecessary. Quite the opposite in fact, given the sheer number of introduction texts he wrote.

Incidentally, on his deathbed, Longchenpa never said "After I die, rely on chos dbyings mdzod". What he said actually was "After I die, rely on the Yangthig Yidbzhin Norbu" a.k.a. the Lama Yangthig.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Altar in Bedroom

Content:

Fa Dao said:

yeaaaah...ok..I get that. I was just wondering why that is considered bad?

Malcolm wrote:

It is considered part of sexual misconduct to screw in front of a shrine of a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

So I and some others are presenting a generic approach to these teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

In my opinion, you and those others lack the necessary qualifications to present these

teachings, generic or not.

Jax said:

The evolution and flowering of a generic Dzogchen in the West is an exciting and challenging prospect.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is an abomination. Such a thing is completely disconnected from the meaning of the teachings as well as the lineage of the teachings so on and so forth.

Jax said:

The other issue is that the lineage teachings are not presenting a format that allows real one on one access to the Guru in the intimate quality that maximizes the benefits.

Malcolm wrote:

Setting oneself up as a guru is not the way to go about "mono a mono" access to a true Dzogchen master. And the only valid Dzogchen teachings are "lineage teachings". Of course, there will always be "teachers" who manifest like mushrooms in a field after rain.

Jax said:

We have to work on that, just signing up and going to a retreat once in awhile is not functional without close instruction. It's a definite problem...

Malcolm wrote:

It is even more of a problem when con artists pretend to be Dzogchen masters in order to make money (whether Tibetan or not), and give invalid teachings of Dzogchen -- this just leads people to lower realms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

For me, I take Longchenpa at his word.

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously you do not. When Longchenpa citations are produced which directly contradict your mistaken assertions, you blithely ignore them.

Likewise with kun byed rgyal po citations that contradict what you state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Altar in Bedroom

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Namdrol,

I have heard that before from other teachers. Why is that?

Malcolm wrote:

It is because people screw in their bedrooms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: nihilism

Content:

ngodrup said:

Indeed. The denial of intangible wisdom phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

Mt. Meru is not an intangible wisdom phenomenon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Can dharma alone make life worth living?

Content:

Thrasymachus said:

My question is:

1) Is dharma alone enough to make life worth living

Malcolm wrote:

Dharma alone makes life worth living.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: rTsa, rTsaI, and the Fruition of Trekchö

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Are there Tibetan (or even Sanskrit) words that would fill in the following blanks?

Trekchö - Kadag - Dharmakaya - Thigle - Essence - Sounds

Thögal - Lhungrub - Sambhogakaya - Lung - Nature - Lights

Yermed - _____ - Nirmanakaya - rTsa - Energy - Rays

Namdrol said:

samapatti; viśuddhi, dharmakāya, tilaka/bindu, svabhāva, śabda

xxxxx ; nirabhogana/anabhogana, sambhogakāya, vāyu, prakriti, ābhāsvarāḥ, prabhā
asambhedaḥ, karuna, nirmanakāya, nāḍī, kāra, raśmi

Greg said:

Just so I'm reading this correctly, "nyingje" should be in the blank spot after Yermed, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Thugs rje -- the honorific form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 7th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Shang Shung Institute Online Tibetan Medicine

Content:

Nangwa said:

Distance learning program starts this year.

<http://www.shangshung.org/home/about/school-of-tibetan-medicine/2012-on-line-tm-program/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Namdrol, any thoughts, comments or suggestions for people who might be interested?

Malcolm wrote:

Learn Tibetan first. it will help.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: The Essential Transmission by Longchenpa

Content:

Jax said:

Isn't Longchenpa pointing to the fact that Awareness (rigpa) cannot be attained by training, practice or any efforts of any kind? He says that because Awareness is fully present right now. Its not hidden. He even says in the same text that no "direct introduction" or realization is necessary. Your cognitive presence that is experiencing, is the experience, of the five senses, as well as your thoughts and emotions...is this

timelessly present Knowingness, that Norbu call pure "noticing". It's not more present after practice or study or transmission. Its the clear unchanging Awareness that appears as everything. Is it really so hard to notice that the Awareness he is speaking of is your present open and clear awareness just as it is?

Malcolm wrote:

No actually, what Longchenpa is talking about vidyā as dharmakāya.

Because vidyā is essenceless, because a substantial active agent is contradicted in the real state, and because it has always been naturally formed, there are no stages to train on, paths to traverse, mandala to create, empowerment to receive, path to meditate, commitments to protect, activities to accomplish and so on. There is no need create again what has already formed naturally. If it were necessary, conventionally designating natural formation as unconditioned would be invalid. Consequently, the dharmakāya would be perishable because it would be conditioned, and because it would have been made by causes and conditions.

The purpose of this statement is to point out that in reality there are no agent and actions so therefore these following things do not exist in vidyā, the dharmakāya. It does not mean that there is nothing to do. Most people are unaware that lhun grub means "not made by anyone". It means that vidyā cannot be fabricated, only recognized.

But Longchenpa does not say that introduction is unnecessary. On the contrary, chapter nine explicitly teaches introduction:

From the two systems in which naked vidyā is suddenly recognized, this is the introduction which does not depend on critical points. Since that stark, uninterrupted and uniform awareness (which does not move outwardly, grasp inwardly, rest in middle, is not fabricated with the mind and is without conceptual movement) exists at all times, by introducing it's naked arising within the state of the blessing at the time when the master and student are momentarily in the same state, starkness is seen nakedly. That alone can generate confidence in dharmakāya. The critical point is to sustain that state without meditation and without distraction.

Then of course there is the system of introduction that depends on six critical points.

However your contention " He even says in the same text that no "direct introduction" or realization is necessary." is proven to be false.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Altar in Bedroom

Content:

The Seeker said:

Thanks for the replies.

Padma, I thought that the statues and stupas, as well as the Dharma text were to be considered Holy objects that deserve respect. I take it as it is stuff, in a store until you purchase it and it has been placed in a place of respect.

But then again, that's just a new comers understanding I guess.

Adamantine, thank you

Kindest wishes, Dave

Malcolm wrote:

You should put your altar in your living room, not in your bedroom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

I just am interested in interacting with people who are interested in approaching the teachings more from a practice perspective as opposed to pure literary discussions. If the discussions are outside the norms for Dharma Wheel, the conversations can be carried on with PM or private messages.

Malcolm wrote:

Most of us have teachers and a practice and have no interest in your instructions or recommendations for practice. And for those who do wish to communicate with you via pm about such topics, caveat emptor.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 11:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

The transmission that I received from Norbu could have been conveyed to me via an excellent book with the same information.

Malcolm wrote:

The Kun byed rgyal po has an entire chapter (chapter 83) on how a devoted student should relate to their guru:

The heart of the teachings, the Kulayarāja, should be given to one who swears "For as long as I and the master should live, while life and body remain connected, your commands will be accomplished".

It is just not the case that a guru is optional in Dzogchen. No Guru, no Dzogchen. Period.

Further, in chapter 27 the Kun byed rgyal po states very clearly:

The inauthentic master teaches scripture like a monkey, his false path beset with concepts.

And it states:

The master who displays the truth is a precious treasury worth an inestimable price.

So this is what authentic Dzogchen teachings state.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 6th, 2012 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Kelwin said:

Online debate is not going to help anyone anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out many times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Fa Dao said:

In point of fact, Norbu Rinpoche maintains the rga thal gyur is the most important text of Dzogchen.

So Namdrol, has this text been translated into English? And if so where does one find it?

A little info on this text would be greatly appreciated by many here I'm sure.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope it has not been translated into English. One of the reasons there is so very little understanding of Dzogchen is that very little of the basic and seminal literature of Dzogchen has been translated into English. The Kun byed rgyal po for example exists one very bad translation by Eva Neumeyer-Dargye and a partial translation by Adriano Clemente. Jim Valby has been translating a two volume commentary on it that is being published in sections and is available from SSI bookstore.

Most of the other texts that are being published are rather late compendiums like Yeshe Lama which are summaries of the main points of the teaching. But the early material sits neglected, piling dust, and acting as nests for insects.

As far as Longchenpa's works go -- I am not very keen on the translations of those that presently exist. In his native language, Longchenpa is a difficult writer at best, very, very intellectual, and the English renditions of his works do not do justice to his writings, I am afraid. People seem to think it is necessary to pile on foreign intellectual bullshit on top of what is already very difficult writing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

I am fully capable of discussing my positions with textual references in as much detail as required.

Malcolm wrote:

When it comes to dancing on books, Jax, I am quite sure I am better at it than you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Kilaya. said:

Okay, what's the difference? I mean, how is the real rainbow body superior to your body dissolving into subtle particles?

Namdrol said:

Simply put, one's body remains in an impure conditioned state since subtle particles are still conditioned phenomena. It means you have not removed all traces of affliction

and karma in your psycho-physical continuum.

Sönam said:

Is that the difference between normal rainbow body and phowa chenpo, where it is said that they did not even manifest death?

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that with so called normal rainbow body you realize the exhaustion of phenomena while in the bardo of dharmatā i.e. during thugdam, whereas in phowa chenpo you realize this during this lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Kilaya. said:

Okay, what's the difference? I mean, how is the real rainbow body superior to your body dissolving into subtle particles?

Namdrol said:

Simply put, one's body remains in an impure conditioned state since subtle particles are still conditioned phenomena. It means you have not removed all traces of affliction and karma in your psycho-physical continuum.

Kilaya. said:

This is an interesting subject, mind if I ask more?

What happens after that? You continue to exist in some subtle form? Or you take birth again in a physical body and practice until you attain the highest level of realization?

Malcolm wrote:

You again take rebirth until you eradicate all traces.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

Namdrol said:

It doesn't matter -- the main point is that it is the correctly one for your year, and that you authenticate it and keep it in your home.

Pema Rigdzin said:

I'm assuming the necessary info to enable one to choose the correct one can be found in ChNN's namkha booklet? Also, you know where properly made namkha can be found for purchase online?

Lastly, without asking you to share anything inappropriate, could you share a little about the benefits you've experienced from your namkha?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a book with complete instructions for calculating ones Namkha-- there is also a computer program for Windows that works too.

<http://tibecal.youhost.com.ar/namkha.php> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

well, it brightens my shrine room considerably.

They are very cheerful and useful. DOing the practice of Namkha balances your energy. You do need to periodically re-authenticate, especially when you are having a problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Kilaya. said:

Okay, what's the difference? I mean, how is the real rainbow body superior to your body dissolving into subtle particles?

Malcolm wrote:

Simply put, one's body remains in an impure conditioned state since subtle particles are still conditioned phenomena. It means you have not removed all traces of affliction and karma in your psycho-physical continuum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

As Buddha and Garab Dorje attained perfect illumination without a Guru, learn to access the Guru within.

Malcolm wrote:

No Jax -- this is not how it is. Buddha and Garab Dorje were emanations, nirmanakāyas. They did not attain anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sems sde will not lead to rainbow body, as ChNN has stated many times.

Kilaya. said:

Is trekchö not part of the semde cycle? I heard from the above mentioned Lama that by perfecting trekchö one attains the rainbow body, while thögal leads to phowa chenpo.

Malcolm wrote:

Trekcho is not sems sde. Trekchö's result is that body dissolves into subtle particles. This is called "rainbow body" but is not true rainbow body, as the above lama, as well as many other masters, have clarified over the centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

So it seems there is no willingness to relinquish fixed opinions that can't be supported on any level.

Malcolm wrote:

Jax, you are not in any position to tell anyone anything -- you have no authority whatsoever to speak of when it comes to Dzogchen with anyone who is not your student.

You are certainly welcome to share, but not to dictate -- clear?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

Ok, I get it Namdrol, I am criticized for scripturally unsupported positions, and then when I support my positions with absolutely appropriate texts, I am "cherry picking". What absurdity! Namdrol, you have no problem with the speciousness of your argument?

I am fully capable of discussing my positions with textual references in as much detail as required.

Malcolm wrote:

Well then do so. Producing a citation without context is meaningless -- that is called "cherry picking".

But in any event, as I said, it is a waste of time to argue about Dzogchen.

Chos dbyings mdzod is a great text, but it also contains a number of criticisms, for example, it criticizes the idea that our ordinary thoughts and concepts are self-originated wisdom; the play of rtsal yes, but wisdom, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Mariusz said:

The situation is not so dramatic There are many other still living masters of Dzogchen now, just for practice with.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know these other teachers personally, so I cannot recommend them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

Like I said Namdrol, I have not violated any samaya that I have pledged to honor, especially not any that I have never been told about by my teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said you violated samaya -- I merely corrected your statement that you do not have any.

Jax said:

What you are quoting is a mish mash of Dzogchen and Tantric precepts.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what I am citing comes directly from the man ngag sde tantras themselves.

Jax said:

Norbu has said numerous times that "if you want to know the real, authentic Dzogchen you must refer to the only Kama text we have, the Kunje Gyalpo."

Malcolm wrote:

This is not Norbu Rinpoche's point of view at all. Moreover, there are many kama texts, the eighteen sems sde lungs of Dzogchen, etc. The reason ChNN started teaching sems sde is that his students were not understanding man ngag sde properly.

Jax said:

None of the contamination by tantric influence is present in KJG.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonesense. You have bought into a rather warped version of Dzogchen history-- the fantasy that at one time there was a pristine Dzogchen removed from all tantric influence -- it is a ludicrous proposition considering the sheer amount of tantric topics that are brought up in the kun byed rgyal po, even if they are brought up to be dismissed.

Jax said:

Norbu said later teachings incorporated Tantric and Vajrayana elements in order to survive in a hostile world of Sarma power players who were doing their best to discredit Dzogchen as a valid Buddhist teaching. These are the words of your teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Norbu Rinpoche is here referring to the treasure tradition where Dzogchen teachings were combined with anuyoga cycles of practice for example, the Khandro Nyinthig, Gongpa Zangthal and so on. However, even here, the Khandro Nyinthig, for example, contains some of the clearest teachings there are on man ngag sde. The Gongpa Zangthal contains many tantras there are pure man ngag sde. It also contains a Shitro cycle, it also contains a cycle on Vajrayogini.

The Vima Nyinthig, however is considered Kama, just like the seventeen tantras.

In point of fact, Norbu Rinpoche maintains the rga thal gyur is the most important text of Dzogchen. The types of doctrines present in man ngag sde are very radical compared to the kun byed rgyal po.

Jax said:

Semde has the same power as the Mahamudra tradition in being able to bring one to full and total realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Sems sde will not lead to rainbow body, as ChNN has stated many times.

[/quote]I teach from the Semde perspective as it is most attuned to the intellectual proclivities of Westerners.[/quote]

I don't agree that Semsde is most attuned to westerners. With respect, I think this is total bullshit. I will agree however that Sems sde has the most detailed presentation of the view. After all, sems sde is mostly about view.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jax:

CYD is a long text with a very long argument -- you cannot just cherry pick quotes from it to suit yourself.

Jax said:

Did you all miss this last post?

Re: No-self and Rigpa

by Jax » Wed Apr 04, 2012 7:23 am

More on "imputations" being the Great Perfection:

Longchenpa writes: "Everything is the perfection of awakened mind. Furthermore there is perfection in oneness, in that everything is perfect within the scope of awareness. There is perfection in duality, in that there is perfection in the creations of ordinary mind (sem)." Choying Dzod.

Jax

Posts: 107

Joined: Wed Mar 07, 2012 9:05 pm

Top

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

I agree Namdrol...

However, well placed "pointing out" can easily bring about an "aha" moment. That is the reason the great masters like Longchenpa and others wrote so extensively. Their writings like Tilopa's, Maitripa's, Saraha's and Niguma's to mention just a few, were meant to trigger a realization of one's Natural State.

Malcolm wrote:

Let us take for example the chos dbyings mdzod. This text is not literature in the commonly understood western idea of the term. This text is meant to be used as a tool for giving introduction by a qualified master. Once someone has received Dzogchen transmission in a proper way, then the text may be used in order to reinforce the meaning of the teachings. But it was never the intent of the authors of texts like Chos dbyings mdzod, the Shabar's Flight of the Garuda and so on that they be read in absence of proper transmission by a qualified Guru.

Jax said:

I actually have never been asked to agree to any samaya by any teacher at any time.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a misunderstanding on your part. While it is true that samaya in Dzogchen is not really a catechistic list such as one finds in Mahayoga and so on, everyone who is an authentic Dzogchen practitioner from having received Dzogchen transmission has samaya. For example, all Dzogchen practitioners have a samaya not to take life. This is the fundamental samaya of the body. Dzogchen practitioners do have a fundamental obligation to observe the principles of basic human decency which is embodied in avoiding the ten non-virtues and adopting the ten virtues. Longchenpa, of whom you are fond, writes in the Ocean of Liberation which is from the Lama Yangthig:

Now then, although there is nothing to damage or transgress, the natural great completion being beyond a boundary to protect, it is necessary for yogins on the path of practice to abide in samaya...

He then goes on to describe in great detail the 27 samayas of a practitioner of Dzogchen (body, speech and mind * outer, inner and secret * outer, inner and secret).

Such tantras as the sgra thal gyur, the rig pa rang shar and so on very clearly explain the meaning of samaya, how it must be kept, the fruit of keeping it, and consequences of not doing so.

Of course, if you choose to ignore samaya, that is your choice, and fundamentally the only person you are harming is yourself.

Jax said:

I guess it's not clear to me why you post here if you feel it can't be of any real value regarding Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are some people who have received transmission from authentic lineage holders of the teachings of Dzogchen, and since I have developed the skill of reading Tibetan, and since I have access to texts normally unavailable to people or only available in translations of questionable merit, people sometimes find my contributions of value. But in general I do not fund my contributions concerning Dzogchen to be of any value whatsoever to people who have not received transmissions in a proper way. For

example, many times people from outside the Dzogchen tradition ask me questions about what sets Dzogchen apart -- and they cannot find any answer that I give satisfactory. The reason of course is that I do not feel it is appropriate to discuss various topics with people who do not have transmission, who do not have the fortune to meet an authentic teacher of Dzogchen like Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche, Loppon Tenzin Namdak and so on, to name three, still living, masters of Dzogchen. Even were I to "tell all" they still will not understand because the nine yānas are all paths based on mind, where as true Dzogchen goes beyond mind and is based on wisdom from the very beginning. Further, this basis in wisdom is based on one's personal experience which arises from one's interaction with a guru, and not on any sort of intellectual analysis.

Jax said:

I differ perhaps in feeling a responsibility to guide and share to the best of my capacity.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many ways to act responsibly. My approach is encourage people to discover the value of Dzogchen teachings by first and foremost receiving transmission from a qualified master. Encouraging them to learn things like Song of the Vajra, and so on as detailed in the Tantras of the Sun and Moon. Encouraging them to keep up ganapujas offered to qualified masters, as is recommended quite clearly in the ultimate root tantra of Dzogchen, the sgra thal gyur, to encourage people to learn about the peaceful and wrathful deities which are crucial part of Dzogchen teachings detailed no less than twice in the Rig pa rang shar, etc. I encourage people to understand the length and breadth of the Dzogchen teachings. Sems sde is fine, but it is primarily confined to view. Those who want to go deeper must engage the Nyingthig teachings. And the details of Nyingthig teachings just are not appropriate for discussion in a public forum, just as it is not proper to run one's mouth about tögal in a bar.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 8:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Dzogchen fundamentally concerns how delusion self-embodies as sentient beings, and what the embodied sentient beings who have good fortune to meet Dzogchen teachings can do to reverse that delusion through which they are embodied. That is all. There is nothing more to Dzogchen than this. The principles involved in reversing that delusion require personal instruction from a master who knows what they are doing.

Dzogchen is based on a personal experience introduced by such a master. That experience cannot be communicated in words to people who do not have that experience. It can only be demonstrated. This is why arguing about Dzogchen on internet forums is hopelessly deluded.

N

Namdrol, that has to be one of the most profound and sad things I have read about Dzogchen in a very long time. Sad because what is one supposed to do if one does not have access to that "personal instruction" you spoke of? (I am guessing that webcasts dont count as personal instruction)

Malcolm wrote:

Webcasts do count as personal instruction. But you have to pay very, very close attention to what is being said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

Namdrol, I disagree. Great benefit can come from discussions that clarify the insight and means to that insight. Much in terms of conceptual deconstruction of deluded self-deceptions can be accomplished. You have been doing that quite well here. Bows... To you!

Malcolm wrote:

That is not Dzogchen, whatever else it might be, Madhyamaka, etc.

While certainly one can dispell uncertainty concerning such things as whether Dzogchen tantras promulgate this or that point of view, in the end, since Dzogchen is based on a personal experience, if one lacks that experience, then most Dzogchen teachings are either pure intellectual verbiage, like sems sde, or hopelessly obscure references that make no sense without having the intimate context of personal experience of the subject matter.

Of course talking about Dzogchen practice among practitioners who understand the teachings can help those of lesser capacity have deeper understanding, but that in general is not what is happening here. What is happening here is mostly lot of negation [dgag] and offering of proofs [sgrub].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

Namdrol, unfortunately those challenging posts are often buried within a litany of critique and assumptions that really are most often too convoluted and rhetorical to respond. It would be great if there was one question, clean and simple quoting one of my comments alone that I can sensibly respond to. I have responded to many specific

questions in great detail. I try to answer several points in one response that should clarify several related questions. I apologize if I missed some questions. I will try to do better...

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen fundamentally concerns how delusion self-embodies as sentient beings, and what the embodied sentient beings who have good fortune to meet Dzogchen teachings can do to reverse that delusion through which they are embodied. That is all. There is nothing more to Dzogchen than this. The principles involved in reversing that delusion require personal instruction from a master who knows what they are doing.

Dzogchen is based on a personal experience introduced by such a master. That experience cannot be communicated in words to people who do not have that experience. It can only be demonstrated. This is why arguing about Dzogchen on internet forums is hopelessly deluded.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 5th, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Jax said:

I challenge you to point out one statement that i have made regarding the "view" of Dzogchen that is inaccurate or misleading.

Malcolm wrote:

People have, but you ignore them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I have the lung for this practice from ChNN and the dvd/cd and booklet set but the set does not include a practice. Where can I get the text for the authentication rite/practice?

Malcolm wrote:

It in the back of the thun book.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Namkhas (colored-thread elemental) are they only Bon?

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Is it more effective to create a namkha for oneself vs. purchasing an authentic one made by others?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't matter -- the main point is that it is the correctly one for your year, and that you authenticate it and keep it in your home.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

Perhaps the Great Perfection IS the imputations and the populating by the intellect with dualisms... As opposed from being separate from or prior to?

Namdrol said:

So pompous elephants of ati would maintain, unable to distinguish sems from rtsal.

Jax said:

Namdrol... Sem is tsal (or rolpa if you prefer) All of the display is "equally" the play or ornament of the Base.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you need to read chos dbyings mdzod, chapter 5, a little more carefully:

In Ati these days, conceited elephants [claim]
the mass of discursive concepts is awakened mind (bodhicitta);
this confusion is a dimension of complete darkness,
a hindrance to the meaning of the natural great perfection.

And:

Thus, the energy of compassion moves from self-originated wisdom, that cognition arisen towards an object is called "play arising from energy". That [cognition] is not self-originated wisdom because of the difference between the existence and non-existence of the object and because if there is no connection with the method, affliction and action leading to existence are generated, and because the nature of conceptuality and

discursivess never transcends samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Pero said:

Well this sucks haha. I still wanted to get some replays from there. That's what I get for being lazy.

Dronma said:

Exactly the same with me!

Does anyone know how this thing works for being able to listen to the replays?

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to be broken

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Why? according to your definition one needs only to generate the meaning of the experience from the third empowerment as i understand it.

Namdrol said:

Because comprehending this meaning depends on one's merit and the instruction of the Guru.

Mariusz said:

So something has to be received also, unconditioned, not only generated from experience of the master, since the master had also one's own master from He/She received this something unconditioned too. Is it true?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the fourth empowerment, an example wisdom, simply contextualizes the experience of the third empowerment and is used to indicate the meaning of the innate. It is not an actual transference of any sort of experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Why? according to your definition one needs only to generate the meaning of the experience from the third empowerment as i understand it.

Malcolm wrote:

Because comprehending this meaning depends on one's merit and the instruction of the Guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Namdrol said:

As tom mentioned, the fourth empowerment is an introduction [to] the meaning of the experience generated by the third empowerment, and this is the same in all four schools.

Mariusz said:

So is it possible to complete one's own HYT path without receiving the fourth empowerment from one's own HYTmaster?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 4th, 2012 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

Anders Honore said:

Is there anything about Dzogchen that should make the question of free will different from Buddhism in general?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Well yes, in Buddhism you have a bunch of old ladies squawking about karma, whereas in Dzogchen you have a bunch of old ladies squawking about self-liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

Perhaps the Great Perfection IS the imputations and the populating by the intellect with dualisms... As opposed from being separate from or prior to?

Malcolm wrote:

So pompous elephants of ati would maintain, unable to distinguish sems from rtsal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Maybe I've misunderstood the meaning of the term 'direct introduction'. If it's simply a transmission of oral instructions based on experience, and the blessings of that instruction, I would agree that the fourth empowerment is a direct introduction.

Malcolm wrote:

As tom mentioned, the fourth empowerment is an introduction the meaning of the experience generated by the third empowerment, and this is the same in all four schools.

A direct introduction has the same meaning as the fourth empowerment but, according to the Nyingma system, does not need to be preceeded by the three lower empowerments.

Sakya Pandita accepts direction introductions given seperately from a formal empowerment, but only if that person has already received a formal empowerment.

The Nyingma and the Kagyu schools maintain that it is not necessary to give formal empowerments as a requirement for receiving direct introduction.

Pahongkha maintained that Tsongkhapa rejected the idea of direct introduction, which is why he altered the transmission of Vajrayogini and excluded the introduction to dharmatā that clearly exists in the Sakya tradition of Naro Khachö from earliest times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

CapN Crunch said:

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/freewill/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; ""Free Will" is a philosophical term of art for a particular sort of capacity of rational agents to choose a course of action from among various alternatives."

Malcolm wrote:

Well this definition itself is flawed since it presumes there are such things as "rational agents" and arguably by this definition anyone who knowingly engages in afflicted conduct is irrational and therefore incapable of free will even though they may be making all kinds of choices.

From a Dzogchen perspective sentient beings are fundamentally irrational since they are entirely products of ignorance and deluded appearances.

In other words, this western philosophical concept is entirely irrelevant to Buddhism, including Dzogchen (which is a form of Buddhism, or rather, an a proposed solution to existential questions found in Buddhism).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

CapN Crunch said:

freewill exists in Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Why? Because you have a will (cetana, volition), and you can direct it wherever you want, including the path of freedom.

No. Why? Because as long as you continue under the power of the five afflictions you will never escape from samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

CapN Crunch said:

...where does sin come into this?

Malcolm wrote:

Free will.

Sin is meaningless unless we have free will to choose to sin or not.

This issue is a complete non-starter in Buddhism.

Determinism is also irrelevant in Buddhism.

We make our own karma, and we can put an end to it too.

Thus, the philosophical context for the question of free will never arises and thus it was never an issue for Buddhists and the issue never comes up as a topic of philosophy in Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Free Will

Content:

CapN Crunch said:

So having said that - How does free will, or the lack thereof correspond to Dzogchen view?

Malcolm wrote:

Free will is of concern only to those who are trying reconcile sin with creation by a creator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

The fourth empowerment is not a direct introduction, it's a description of the Spiritual Master's experience as a pointing out instruction that gives powerful blessings, but not a mystical transfer of his complete experience.

Malcolm wrote:

A direct introduction is not a mystical transfer of a master's complete experience. It is a pointing out instruction. It does not transfer the master's realization (that is impossible), it communicates the student's own state.

Actually the word translated as "introduction" and "pointing out" is the same word i.e. ngo phrad.

Tsongkhapa said:

Regarding Sakya Pandita, didn't he say that Dzogchen was not Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Pandita criticized certain trends he saw in the Nyingma (much in the same way that Gorampa and Shakya Chogden criticized certain trends in Gelug), but he never stated that Dzogchen was not Buddhism, quite the opposite. He stated in fact that he had received Dzogchen teachings and respected them, as is stated plainly in his Analysis of the Three Vows. In fact, Sapan reserved most of his criticisms for the Kagyu school, spending very little time on the Nyingma school. After all, Sapan is a very important master for Vakjrakilaya teachings. Dzogchen is the ancestral teaching of the Khon family.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 8:41 PM

Title: Re: Finally! Mahamudra Library of Tibetan Classics Volume

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

One of my teachers just informed me that he will be giving instructions on the section of this volume that deals with the mahamudra writings of Gampopa. Does anybody have a list of the texts included in the volume?

I want to read them before the retreat but, unless things go hideously right, I doubt I will have the \$70 needed to buy the book sometime soon.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahamudra and Related Instructions: Core Teachings of the Kagyu Schools (Library of Tibetan Classics) by Peter Roberts and Peter Alan Roberts (Kindle Edition - May 10, 2010) - Kindle eBook

Buy: \$29.99

You can buy it in a kindle edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Question ~ Answer Thread

Content:

Wesley1982 said:

Do you follow a daily routine or daily schedule? . .

Malcolm wrote:

First, find a teacher. Make sure they are qualified by observing their character for a number of years while learning Buddhism at the same time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

... (and Sakya Pandita) don't accept it.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not true. Sakya Pandita accepted direct introduction, but only subsequent to having received empowerments. The fourth empowerment is in fact a direct introduction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Totoro said:

According to the Sakya lineage, there are two kinds of persons, those who require the gradual training you mention (rim gyis pas), and those who are able to enter Vajrayāna teachings immediately without prior training (cig car bas). These two types of persons are clearly demonstrated in Aryadeva's commentary on the Pañcakrama.

Thus, it is best to understand that there are different approaches for different people.

N

འོ་རིམ་གྱིས་པ་ (rim gyis pa)

<noun> "That which proceeds gradually" or "gradual type". One of a pair of terms. The opp. is cig car ba, that which proceeds without any stages, that which goes at once.

In the language of the buddhist tantras, two types of practitioner are identified: the rim gyis pa is the gradual type, the person who goes to liberation by stages; the cig car ba is the sudden type, the one who goes to it immediately. Acc. Tenga Rinpoche, the general distinction is as follows. The gradual type person is someone who has not developed a connection to the practice previously or who has only developed a small connection to it. Because of this, they have to work at the practice again and again before it comes to fruit. A sudden type is someone who has developed a great connection to or realization of the practice previously and therefore, when they meet the teaching again, they are capable of realizing it all at once.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a little different than the standard distinction between these two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Will said:

N. - you mean that the sutric ethical, dialectical & meditative foundation are never used as a preliminary practice? Surely in every lifetime those basic methods & practices must be recapitulated by everyone? For the very advanced that revisiting of such basic practices may take only a few years (or less?), but all must have that foundation.

Namdrol said:

I never engaged in them. I entered Vajrayāna from the beginning without engaging in lam rim teachings.

Tom said:

Still, even if introduced later aren't sutra topics such as Abhidharma foundational for Tantric practice in Sakya? Actually, I have found Sakya lamas to be more concerned about their Vajrayana students understanding of basic Abhidharma topics even more than Gelugpa lamas.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally in Sakya, they backfill. In other words, people are given abhisheka right away, and then instructed to learn whatever they need to contextualize their Vajrayāna practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

according to the lineage of Atisha and Je Tsongkhapa.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Sakya lineage, there are two kinds of persons, those who require the gradual training you mention (rim gyis pas), and those who are able to enter Vajrayāna teachings immediately without prior training (cig car bas). These two types of persons are clearly demonstrated in Aryadeva's commentary on the Pañcakrama.

Thus, it is best to understand that there are different approaches for different people.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is it possible to progress through...
without necessity of sutra methods or not?

Namdrol said:

From the point of view of Nyingma, Sakya and so on, definitely.

Will said:

N. - you mean that the sutric ethical, dialectical & meditative foundation are never used as a preliminary practice? Surely in every lifetime those basic methods & practices must be recapitulated by everyone? For the very advanced that revisiting of such basic practices may take only a few years (or less?), but all must have that foundation.

Malcolm wrote:

I never engaged in them. I entered Vajrayāna from the beginning without engaging in lam rim teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Namdrol said:

You are free to disagree of course, but I don't believe in the existence of 600 year old human beings.

Mariusz said:

Li_Ching-Yuen https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Li_Ching-Yuen

Malcolm wrote:

And this is proof of what?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is it possible to progress through...
without necessity of sutra methods or not?

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of Nyingma, Sakya and so on, definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Nagarjuna was known as a Alchemist, and one of the Siddhis of Alchemy is the "Elixir of Long Life".

Is living for over 600 years any more far-fetched than other Siddhis described in Buddhist writings?

Or are the descriptions of the phenomena (or Noumena) of Siddhis only allegorical/metaphorical?

Malcolm wrote:

It is clearly a case of mistaken identity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Anders Honore said:

I think it's a vajrayana thing to reduce Madhyamika to a mere dialiectic tool. It certainly isn't so in its east-asian incarnation and I think neither was it so in its Indian incarnation.

gregkavarnos said:

In the Kagyu tradition Nagarjuna is one of the Mahasiddha, thus quite clearly a philosopher AND a great practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think we can seriously consider the Nāgārjuna who lived in the 2nd century CE and authored the Madhyamaka corpus to be the same person who was a disciple of Saraha in the eighth century and authored the Pañcakrama and other Vajrayāna texts. You are free to disagree of course, but I don't beleive in the existence of 600 year old human beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not for beginners. Only for advanced pracitioners.

Mariusz said:

The ones who really enter HYT methods.

Malcolm wrote:

What Tsongkhapa is saying is that until one gains advanced proficiency in completion stage, one must rely on Madhyamaka analysis in tandem with the two stages. He is never saying that one may begin to engage [i.e. enter] in HYT practices without having done extensive analysis based on Madhyamaka texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Namdrol said:

Well, what Tsongkhapa is saying here is that first you generate the view in accordance with Madhyamaka texts. Then, outside of the context of creation and completion one still engages in Madhyamaka analysis.

However, advanced meditators in the completion stage have no further need to engage in such analysis and so they don't.

N

Mariusz said:

Yes. For me it is also. So in this case the HYT methods are sufficient alone without any need for the sutra adding even according to Tsongkhapa . No necessity for mixing the both.

Malcolm wrote:

Not for beginners. Only for advanced practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 2nd, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Tom said:

Obviously from his writings it appears Tsongkhapa thought otherwise!

Mariusz said:

It is not so obvious. Here you have a quote on the analysis (sutra methods) which is not performed during HYTantra:

(Tsongkhapa's Final Exposition of Wisdom; page.158) Our own system is as follows:

Even in the context of Highest Yoga [Mantra] the system (Vajrayana) of generating understanding of the view must be done in accordance with what occurs in the Middle Way texts. With respect to how it is sustained, on some occasions during states subsequent to meditative equipoise on the stages of generation and completion, one takes suchness to mind within analyzing it, but when those on the stage of completion who have attained the capacity to put penetrative focus on essential points in the body sustain suchness in meditative equipoise, although they definitely must meditate within setting [the mind] in the context of the view, they do not perform the analytical meditation of special insight as it occurs in other texts. Therefore, with respect to that occasion, do not posit analytical meditation as one-pointed meditation on suchness from within the context of the view ancillary to stabilizing [meditation].

Malcolm wrote:

Well, what Tsongkhapa is saying here is that first you generate the view in accordance with Madhyamaka texts. Then, outside of the context of creation and completion one still engages in Madhyamaka analysis.

However, advanced meditators in the completion stage have no further need to engage in such analysis and so they don't.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

So there's apparently no such thing as Kunzhi (Alaya) by itself, as Kunzhi (Alaya) is either shorthand for Kunzhi-Namshe or longhand for gZhi (someone correct me if I'm mistaken).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a kun gzhi which stands by itself.

In dzogchen we have the gdod ma' spyi gzhi, "the original general basis".

The we have the kung gzhi (ālaya), which arises from ignorance. From the ālaya or all-basis eight eight consciousness, including the ālayavijñāna (all-basis consciousness), dependent origination's twelve links and so on arise.

Not distinguishing the kun gzhi from the gzhi causes a lot of problems for people when trying to understand Dzogchen.

For example, the a text from the dgongs pa zang thal states:

The all-basis is the bardo of all,
unconsciousness, unclear, and inexpressible,
does not form wisdom, being the cause of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Question ~ Answer Thread

Content:

bodhipunk said:

Here's another assessment straight from Buddha himself, "Both formerly and now, it is only dukkha that I describe, and the cessation of dukkha."

Wesley1982 said:

Dukkha is called one of the 4 noble truths. Correct?

Malcolm wrote:

Sarvadukkham -- suffering is everywhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Question ~ Answer Thread

Content:

Wesley1982 said:

Can the complete teachings of the Buddha be assessed in a -{easy/medium/difficult}- fashion? . .

Malcolm wrote:

All conditioned things are impermanent.

All afflicted things are suffering.

All things lack identity.

Nirvana is peace.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and space

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="catmoon"]Space is a fundamental concept in Buddhism. /quote]

There are two kinds of space talked about in Buddhism -- unconditioned space which is

simple absence of obstruction and conditioned space, which means cavities.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

yes, as you say, "among other things" but in the last retreat webcast he seemed to be pretty clearly saying rigpa is not your real nature, it is your knowledge of your real nature (or words to that effect). whereas, as in the vimaningthig you posted:

3) The vidyā present as the basis is the reality of the essence, original purity, that exists possessing the three primordial wisdoms.

rigpa/vidya* is being used as a synonym for the basis, our real nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct. And the word is used both ways in Dzogchen texts. But what ChNN is emphasizing is the one basis, two paths, two results approach of the dgongs pa zang thal. I.e. he is presenting vidyā in its aspect as the experience of path (from among the trio of the vidyā of the basis, mentioned above; the path and the result) which is clearly discussed in those teachings.

gad rgyangs said:

* why use the sanskrit term when there are no sanskrit dzogchen texts, and probably never were? the tibetan term suffices, methinks.

Malcolm wrote:

Because the word vidyā is the term used in titles such as the rig pa rang shar tantra, etc., and because the term vidyā has cognates in English through Latin and is connected with seeing and vision. And finally, mostly, because I prefer to use Sanskrit terms such as vidyā, dharmadhātu, prajñā, dharmakāya, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is basically no difference in methods. Yangti methods such as dark retreat and so on occur in Snying thig as well.

In snying thig there is the unsurpassed secret cycle. This equals yang ti.

Pero said:

Didn't you mention once that yang ti considers itself superior?

Malcolm wrote:

All Dzogchen texts have abundant triumphalist rhetoric.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 1st, 2012 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Jax said:

Xabir, what you wrote is very interesting but Nagarjuna was not totally comfortable with the view of the Abidharma as it colored the Buddhist view of his day. Consciousness in Abidharma is strictly "sem" or afflicted karmic mind that arises dependently. This consciousness is not Rigpa Awareness or the unchanging cognitive Knowing of the Dharmakaya. The vision you describe is the more nihilistic nirvana of Abidharma theory. Dzogchen, especially thogal and Yangti offers the view of the Thigle Chenpo and Thigle Nyak Chik, Great Hyper Sphere and Unique Singularity. Beyond the skandha of consciousness you have the qualities of omniscience, clairvoyance and telepathy etc. All of which pertain to Buddha Mind, realized after the "collapse" of skandhic "consciousness". It's beyond, beyond at the other shore, the other shore that is always fully present right here in every moment as the only cognitive Presence in and as all experience.

xabir said:

Pardon my very limited understanding on this... may others correct me if I am wrong too.

In post-Yogacara teaching, consciousness is understood as dualistic vision, to be distinguished from Wisdom which is non-dualistic. But in Pali suttas, the original teachings of the Buddha, no such division was being taught - so there is no talk about converting consciousness into wisdom - consciousness is simply these six types of cognizance that arises whether you are awakened... except that for the awakened and liberated, there is cognizance/consciousness without taints or ignorance, while for the unawakened there is the instant of cognizance/consciousness quickly followed by the taints, the craving, attachment, and identification with 'I, me, mine'. In other words it is not the 'cognizance/consciousness' that is the problem, it is the taints, the ignorance, the grasping that is the problem.

For post-Yogacara teachings, consciousness is understood to be dualistic vision, so consciousness must be transformed into wisdom. In Dzogchen, I think it is not too different in this respect, as Namdrol once said: Further, there is no rigpa to speak of that exists separate from the earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness that make up the universe and sentient beings. Rigpa is merely a different way of talking about these

six things. In their pure state (their actual state) we talk about the radiance of the five wisdoms of rig pa. In their impure state we talk about how the five elements arise from consciousness. One coin, two sides. And it is completely empty from beginning to end, and top to bottom, free from all extremes and not established in anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

Longchenpa also discuss the meditation of Dzogchen in the following way:

Just as reflections arise in limpid water, the eyes and clairvoyances will arise from limpid vidyā. Moreover, one should practice by leaving the unobstructed sense faculties in their own limpidity. Since the main organ, the eyes, are limpid, vidyā is limpid, because the eyes are the gate of the personal experience of wisdom. Otherwise, just as the appearances of reflections do not condition the water, [35/b] likewise, even though all outer appearances arise as a brilliant vision, since one's awareness does become lost among such appearances, it is said "they are not established in vidyā". The sense of this is also demonstrated in the Pramanaviniścaya: Having included everything in the mind, since there is no movement from this inner nature, the form [seen by] the eye arises from the power of that intellect of sight.

This passage from the Pramanaviniścaya, while obscure, is in fact a description of what we call pratyakṣa, direct perception or personal experience as mentioned above. So, in fact you are correct, the key point of meditation in Dzogchen is simply to let all sense objects meet their respective sense organs, as Longchenpa says "likewise, even though all outer appearances arise as a brilliant vision, since one's awareness does become lost among such appearances, it is said "they are not established in vidyā"."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

You can either emphasize the ineffability of the base, or talk around it forever (which is a lot of fun actually), but either way the first thing is recognizing it. ChNNR seems to be campaigning for an adjustment of Dzogchen terminology, where "rigpa" is no longer to be used also as a synonym for the base itself (as it often is in the old texts) but is to be reserved for our knowledge of the base.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no campaign, he is right. Rigpa, among other things, is exactly the knowledge of

the display of the basis as one's own display, and ignorance is ignorance of that.

gad rgyangs said:

What does this knowledge "look like"? It can not be conceptual, otherwise just reading sentences like the quote above would be rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

There are five types of vidyā described by Vimalamitra in the Vima Snying thig i.e. 1) the vidyā that apprehends characteristics; 2) the vidyā that apprehends or appropriates the basis; 3) the vidyā that is present as the basis; 4) the vidyā of insight; and 5) the vidyā of thögal.

1) The vidyā that apprehends characteristics: “the vidyā that imputes phenomena as universals and as mere personal names”, is one’s mere non-conceptual self-knowing awareness defiled by many cognitions.

2) The [vidyā that] appropriates the basis creates all cognitions when present in one’s body, present as the mere intrinsic clarity [of those cognitions], is called “unripened vidyā”.

3) The vidyā present as the basis is the reality of the essence, original purity, that exists possessing the three primordial wisdoms. The vidyā which is not covered by partiality is present as the essence of omniscient wisdom. Further, that primordial wisdom is present as a subtle primordial wisdom. If that primordial wisdom did not exist, there would be no liberation from emptiness. Further, there would be no liberation from the inert. However, if vidyā exists as primordial wisdom, it would be no different than the realist’s nirmanakāya.

4) The vidyā of insight is those vivid appearances when the instruction is demonstrated. It is called “the essence of the self-apparent thigle”. As there are many unmixed appearances, the Teacher stated: Everything arose from non-arising, showing the great miraculous display in every way.

5) The vidyā of thögal is the absence of increase or decrease in experience having reached the full measure of appearance through practice. Having completed all the signs and qualities, also they are not established by their own nature. When self-manifesting as omniscient wisdom, it [the vidyā of thögal] is called “abandoning phenomena”, “the exhaustion of phenomena”, “beyond phenomena”, “liberated from phenomena”, and “no arising even in mere arising”.

So the issue really is complex and there are many different ways or angles from which to discuss vidyā or rigpa.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there is the irreducible presence of the here and now where we find ourselves.

Malcolm wrote:

It's reducible, thank goodness.

In any event, what you are talking about is the famous "clarity" aspect of the mind, the famed Descartes trope, "I can doubt everything but that fact that I am doubting". But this hardly constitutes "the fact of the existent".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the fact of the existent is given. everything else, like defining just what the existent is or isn't, is conceptual.

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting, Dante, I wouldn't have pegged you for being a realist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Dronma said:

That's all. Nothing more to say. [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't exist. There is no better term, otherwise, I would be using it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:47 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Dronma said:

Personally I prefer the latter, because the first notion leads to nihilism or zero, which is wrong. [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not nothingness since somethingness was not proposed to begin with.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Dronma said:

Chaos (Greek χάος khaos) refers to the formless or void state preceding the creation of the universe or cosmos in the Greek creation myths.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Dronma said:

How can nothing manifest something?

Namdrol said:

It doesn't. The Dzogchen view is that everything is completely equivalent with an illusion.

""Hey, hey, apparent yet non existent retinue: listen well! There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, discriminating knowledge does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway."
-- The Unwritten Tantra

Dronma said:

Exactly! Please remember that I am always talking here about linguistic expression. I am sure there must be better words to express "this".

Well, according to my language which I have much better knowledge, I think that instead of κενότητα - emptiness, the word χάος - chaos is more closed to the concept of infinitum which has all potentialities but no inherent formation at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Stong (སྟོང་) in tibetan is related to stongs (སྟོངས་), which means to empty out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Dronma said:

How can nothing manifest something?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. The Dzogchen view is that everything is completely equivalent with an illusion.

"“Hey, hey, apparent yet non existent retinue: listen well! There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, discriminating knowledge does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway.”
-- The Unwritten Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

Namdrol said:

śūnyatā is a term in Indian mathematics which means 0.

N

Dronma said:

Sure, there is no doubt about that. But zero can manifest only zero, according to mathematics.

So, "this" which is manifesting everything and it is full of potentialities cannot be zero!

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it can.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 31st, 2012 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: No-self and Rigpa

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

The moment a subject relates to an object, acceptance and rejection, attachment and aversion, are immediately present. There's no harm in implementing the conventional

concept of "no-self" as long as it's understood to be just that. The very self it (concept of no-self) negates arises from (and is sustained by) the very act of accepting/rejecting which is perpetually reborn as long as experience is dominated and swept away by the plague of delusion the initial (no-self) concept attempts to reveal. So you're right to be weary of this notion, however while you're correct in stating that only the "self" would dualistically accept/reject the self/no-self, it must also be taken into account that likewise only the "self" would accept/reject the acceptance/rejection of the self/no-self. It becomes an inescapable downward spiral (hence the endless cycle of samsara, the shoreless ocean of suffering). This is why skillful means and right view are so imperative. The more one struggles to escape, the tighter samsara's noose becomes around one's throat. But at the same time utter non-action is the same death sentence. There's no going beyond acceptance and rejection, it was empty from the start, the unestablished cannot go beyond that which is likewise primordially unestablished. There was never two to begin with.

When the [ultimate] truth is explained as it is, the conventional is not obstructed; Independent of the conventional, no [ultimate] truth can be found. - Nagarjuna

Dronma said:

Well said!

However I was talking about the linguistic expression, and not about the essential meaning which is beyond words anyway.

Even the terms "emptiness" or "voidness" are not really accurate for expressing śūnyatā or stong-pa nyid.

I feel that they are incomplete and maybe misleading.

Although in between "emptiness" and "voidness", I prefer the latter.

I have the same doubt with the Greek versions of those 2 words. They are not accurate either.

Malcolm wrote:

śūnyatā is a term in Indian mathematics which means 0.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 30th, 2012 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

Sometimes what appears to a student as something negative is based on the limited understanding of the student.

Malcolm wrote:

It is possible to slide a lot of bullshit under this rug.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 30th, 2012 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

Namdrol said:

Both.

YangtiConfusion said:

So is this "yangti" terminology not found in Bon?

Namdrol said:

dark retreat and so on on occur in Snying thig as well.

YangtiConfusion said:

But only in something like Gongspa Zangthal right? Not in most nyingthig?

Malcolm wrote:

No, in all major snying thig cycles.

The practices of snying thig, yang ti, etc, are also found in Bon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 30th, 2012 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: On the Bardo - Stuck souls?

Content:

bardoq said:

I'm a little puzzled that you say that very few people see anyone in the Bardo, if it's so difficult, how has it then been possible to discover the max limit of 49 days and the "small deaths"? Someone must have been able to verify their existence over an extended period of time, right? And I would like to ask such a lama/tulku some follow-up questions, too.

Malcolm wrote:

49 days is symbolic number, not a fixed number.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 30th, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Confused on Yangti generalities

Content:

YangtiConfusion said:

1. Is yangti a practice or a Nyingma classification of literature? Or both? See following link:

<http://www.thlib.org/collections/texts/jiats/#!jiats=/01/germano/b8/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Both.

YangtiConfusion said:

4. If you practice in Yangti methods for awhile and then switch over to the Seminal Heart, would the progress of the first automatically translate into the second?

Malcolm wrote:

There is basically no difference in methods. Yangti methods such as dark retreat and so on occur in Snying thig as well.

In snying thig there is the unsurpassed secret cycle. This equals yang ti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

heart said:

One even stranger thing was that this Geshe insisted that someone meditating on emptiness would not see or experience the world around him. Like emptiness was separate from phenomena somehow.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

This is a sūtrayāna idea.

Mariusz said:

Can you quote any sutra on "emptiness as separated from phenomena somehow"?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the idea to which I am referring.

The idea to which I am referring is that when one is having a non-conceptual direct experience of emptiness on the path of seeing, etc. one does not have perception of phenomena. This how non-conceptuality is interpreted by those in sūtrayāna i.e. no eyes, not ears, etc.

And this is why Gelugpas frequently make the claim mentioned above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:44 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

heart said:

One even stranger thing was that this Geshe insisted that someone meditating on emptiness would not see or experience the world around him. Like emptiness was separate from phenomena somehow.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

This is a sūtrayāna idea.

heart said:

Yes, but the heart sutra is also from the sutrayana, right?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this idea comes from the PP sutras mainly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:43 PM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Then don't name the women. If you keep the teacher's names quiet, than what about all the new students that arrive, with no idea what they may be in for? History repeats, unless provoked. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Yup quite true. But in naming the teachers, the women will be harmed. There is just no way to avoid it. Until they are willing to go public what to do? But these women feel constrained by many issues.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 12:45 PM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

But...this is a pervasive problem in dharma centers in the West. To think otherwise is to be ignorant. I personally know instances (yes plural) of woman pressured to have abortions after they have been impregnated by their teachers.

Adamantine said:

That's really disturbing. I wonder why you keep the names quiet.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not about the teachers, it is about protecting the women from further harm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 12:07 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

heart said:

One thing he often said was that Buddha nature is like a seed, then you have to make it grow with the nourishment of the accumulation of merit and wisdom.

Sherab said:

I too have problem with the idea of Buddha nature as a seed that needs to be grown. This contradicts the Prajnaparamita sutras where one reads that enlightenment is not obtained or attained. It also contradicts the classification of nirvana as unconditioned.

heart said:

One even stranger thing was that this Geshe insisted that someone meditating on emptiness would not see or experience the world around him. Like emptiness was separate from phenomena somehow.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

This is a sūtrayāna idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 10:54 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Then of course there is also the question how many Yidams one actually need to practice as a Dzogchen practitioner?

/magnus

Namdrol said:

The answer is none. Zero.

heart said:

Of course, but it helps just like all the preliminaries. But will 50 Yidams help more, I don't think so.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 10:46 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

There are many problems you can find in institutionalized Tibetan Buddhism...

Malcolm wrote:

I can't speak to the Sanghas you frequent since I do not know them, apart from Shenphen Rinpoche, and I know he is a good guy. I really do have full confidence in him.

But...this is a pervasive problem in dharma centers in the West. To think otherwise is to be ignorant. I personally know instances (yes plural) of woman pressured to have abortions after they have been impregnated by their teachers.

One of the problems is a corrupted idea of samaya -- women subject to harrasment, etc. in Tibetan Buddhist dharma centers feel silenced by "vows" and so they do not speak up for many reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

I also feel like you are being willfully obtuse for someone who follows terma traditions and who was close with Ngakpa Yeshe Dorje who was able to alter weather patterns on a regular basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Ngagpa Rinpoche could control weather, but it is not a miracle. Doubtless, there are some people who can control the elements.

My point is that there is no reason to accept any of this on faith and nor should one.

Adamantine said:

Another huge impediment is that women are not treated as equals in Tibetan Buddhism. In particular, young attractive women are subject to tremendous sexual attention, most of it unwanted, as well as actual harassment, emotional abuse and scare tactics which prevent them from speaking out.

I am sure this happens sometimes.. but this is not particular to Tibetan Buddhism. This is particular to men-in-general across the globe. Men's libidos cause great harm to women, in various ways, across all traditions and among all those who hold no tradition. This is the sad truth. To blame Tibetan Buddhism for having men who also engage in this harmful stupidity is the same as blaming "Tibetan Buddhism" for having samsaric individuals in it that aren't yet Buddhas. Of course, not everyone practicing Dharma is yet a Buddha, and is subject to craving and aversion... and not everyone's conduct is in line with relative Dharma ethics. But this hardly can be determined to be a downfall of Tibetan Buddhism in particular. If that were true, then you wouldn't find these same downfalls across the board on a global scale. This is a human downfall. I don't think any Buddhas have acted in this way.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Pretending that this not a problem in Tibetan Buddhism is merely to put on your blinders. Until we accept that this is a problem in Tibetan Buddhism, it will not be properly addressed. This is just like saying pedophilia is not a Catholic problem, it is a problem with men across the world. Well, there are ways in which pedophilia was institutionalized in Catholicism, and ways in which sexual harassment and so on are institutionalized in Tibetan Buddhism -- the sooner we recognize that fact and stop wishing it would just go away, the sooner women will feel safer around Tibetan teachers. You see, I know at least a dozen women who have been on the short end of that stick, and for them it is not pretty, and it is not fair.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

You certainly appear to be clinging to this fabrication you call "common-sense".

And I simply don't have as much faith in historical empiricism as you do...

Malcolm wrote:

Look, the simple fact is that Tibetan Buddhism, like every other faith in the world, needs to adapt to the modern age. It is trying to adapt -- I am not suggesting that it needs to abandon its narratives, principles such as rebirth, and so on. But when it comes to how it works its way through the world, the teachings need to adapt themselves to the society in which they find themselves. Mahasiddhas stopping the sun are not essential to Dzogchen or Tibetan Buddhism. Insisting such stories are "true" is actually a huge impediment for many people who might otherwise come to the Dharma.

Another huge impediment is that women are not treated as equals in Tibetan Buddhism. In particular, young attractive women are subject to tremendous sexual attention, most of it unwanted, as well as actual harassment, emotional abuse and scare tactics which prevent them from speaking out. This is not of course a problem isolated to Tibetan Buddhism -- sexual harassment of women is a worldwide issue. But the fact that it exists in Tibetan Buddhism needs to be recognized and not explained away, justified or otherwise ignored.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

The only I have ever seen around Lamas that defies common sense is the willingness of people to lose it.

Adamantine said:

That's sad, if true. Well, you still have more life ahead of you. . .

Your dualistic framework of "either it's this or it's that" is not quite in line with how Buddhas communicate about the nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha's framework is "Where this exists, that exists, with the arising of that, this arose."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Your dualistic framework of "either it's this or it's that" is not quite in line with how Buddhas communicate about the nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha's framework is "Where this exists, that exists, with the arising of that, this arose."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Namdrol said:

Greed may be a failing but it is not a cause for a Vajrayāna student to criticize their teacher.

Sönam said:

That's why it's important to ponderate ... and not to excessively enter in a cycle of opinion, judgement and so on. Most of the discomfort could be resolved by splitting without necessarily providing a commentary. Of course if a guru is outrageously lying or abusing it should be reported ... but except for that, the best is only to quit.

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Funny how no one ever sees these "miracles" actually done. Oh right, we don't have enough merit, I forgot.

Adamantine said:

Sure, plenty of people see miracles. I have experienced enough that defies common sense not to entrust my faith to common-sense. Frankly, in all your time practicing Dharma and being around the Lamas you have, I'd be surprised if you've never experienced anything that defies "common sense". If you haven't, than I suppose it explains our different positions.

Malcolm wrote:

The only I have ever seen around Lamas that defies common sense is the willingness of people to lose it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

I think you've maxed out on the number of times you can use that example. But since it's your favorite, I'll give it a go:

If Virupa was indeed a Mahasiddha, and he was working with the display of appearances

to play with the presumptions of those in his immediate environment-- why would he want to scare the

shit out of an entire world? I think you are really clinging to something that you feel should make sense to you, about a display that goes beyond sense altogether. This misses the point.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have in fact admitted this is not a historical event, whatever else it may have been, and he did not stop the world's rotation on its axis (required for "stopping the sun").

So Mahasiddhas distort the perceptions of those whom they are trying to impress? Is that how it works?

Mahasiddhas can no more violate dependent origination than anyone else can.

I am not clinging to anything -- I don't take the stories of mahāsiddha's miracles literally, never have, never felt the need to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

If we don't believe that anything is possible, then we no longer believe in Sunyata. We are either nihilists or eternalists.

Namdrol said:

If you think that apple trees can grow from wheat seeds, you have left the realm of common sense.

N

Adamantine said:

Well, hand prints in rock, or Milarepa fitting inside a yak's horn...these have all left common sense far behind. Vajrayana is meant to invoke uncommon sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Funny how no one ever sees these "miracles" actually done. Oh right, we don't have enough merit, I forgot.

If you assume for example that Virupa really stopped the sun such a cataclysmic event should have been recorded around the world. Can you imagine?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

There have been much greater numbers of authors in general in the West (what exactly are we defining as the West here?), so proportionally this is not a fair accounting. Also, you are clearly grouping many countries and multiple land masses into your accounting of what is the "West", and opposing it to India and Tibet, two countries only. I hardly think your comparisons are useful. Also, you deflect the issue of whether women are considered to have as great or greater potential as men onto an issue of authorship, which is a bit of a red-herring. Many yogis and yoginis who reach high levels of realization don't author texts.

Malcolm wrote:

Can you provide a citation from a primary text which states that women have more potential than men for awakening? I personally do not believe that gender makes one person superior to another person in terms of capacity for awakening. I think it is a very silly thing to say.

If Tibetan tradition truly maintains that women had a greater potential for awakening than men, it would stand to reason that it would report more instances of awakened women than men. But in fact there are very few reports of awakened women as

opposed to endless litneys of men who are supposed to have achieved awakening.

While it is certainly the case that we can find positive messages about woman's potential for awakening in many tantras, in general Tibetan cultural practice, woman have been very disadvantaged.

If we take just one culture, Anglo-American culture, and compare it with Indo-Tibetan culture, the incidence of female authorship is much higher in our culture than in Indo-Tibetan culture. Why? It is quite simple -- in old Tibet educating women was not the norm, it was by far and away the exception. Of course, through the influence of Western values, Tibetan culture has decided to value the education of women, and this is a good thing, a positive direction. But there is still enormous sexism in both cultures, our and their's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

YogaDude11 said:

Have you had any experiences similar to what i have described?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but they are just experiences.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Okay. I have one question about samaya. What if the teacher falls into dualistic grasping in a such a way as to buy into a common run of the mill worldly point of view that the student thinks is petty?

Namdrol said:

The student should mind his own business.

deepbluehum said:

What if the teacher exhibits greed?

Malcolm wrote:

Greed may be a failing but it is not a cause for a Vajrayāna student to criticize their

teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

If we don't believe that anything is possible, then we no longer believe in Sunyata. We are either nihilists or eternalists.

Malcolm wrote:

If you think that apple trees can grow from wheat seeds, you have left the realm of common sense.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Samaya is not koolaid, though it seem that many people treat it as such. Insitutionally mandated sexism does not need to be a part of Vajrayāna -- this just leads to the ruthless exploitation of women. Justifying it by invoking Machig Labdron is just sad.

N

Adamantine said:

I interpret this story of Machig in the same light as I would Padmasambhava being swallowed and eaten by his female teacher Kungamo,

Malcolm wrote:

The former (if true) is a story of teacher who gives a student a disease (though in fact the story hinges on ML breaking samaya and contracting a disease). The later is a story of a common feature of many initiations.

Adamantine said:

or Tilopa provoking Naropa to get the living crap beat out of him by a wedding party, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Tilopa, supposedly, had the power to completely restore Naropa to health.

Adamantine said:

If we decide that the stories of the siddhas are just fantasy, bent on political ends, and hold mundane views of social politics and western scientific materialism as supreme--

Malcolm wrote:

I think TNR's defense of Kosha Cosmology is pretty poor, frankly, since it also depends on us accepting the the Bible, the Koran and so on as superior to western empirical science.

Adamantine said:

then it seems to me that this would render our faith in vajrayana and guru yoga sterile, and there wouldn't be much point in following this path at all.

Malcolm wrote:

If we are following Vajrayāna because of some miraculous tale, we are doomed before we have even started.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Jax said:

Namdrol, what do think of Germano's research regarding sPyti being a reaction to the tantric elements being so broadly integrated into Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Highly speculative. The spyi ti texts were largely produced by Nyangral, one of the major promulgators of Nyingma tantric cycles in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

how Gurus may expect free labor for Dharma centers etc. then this is deeply built into the Dharma itself-- not related to Tibetan political structures.. The Vajrayana is founded on the model of mandalas in the form of kingdoms, with the Yidam/Guru on thrones in the center of palaces, etc. And serving the Guru and the Dharma are considered the supreme way to generate merit. . . If you have issue with these things, which is generally why the social-structures of Dharma centers arise the way they do-- then you aren't critiquing Tibetan culture per se you are criticizing the nature of Vajrayana itself.

Malcolm wrote:

The model of Vajrayāna that emerged in India during the 8-12 centuries is very much a reflection of the style of feudalism and vassalage present in Indian culture, a model Tibetans adapted to their own feudal system.

Serving the master and the Dharma is wonderful. But such service can be easily perverted to worldly ends.

I have observed before that in a real sense, anuttarayoga tantra is not suited to institutional practice of the kind we see in Tibetan culture.

Many absolutist notions about gurus we find in traditional sources (where they are not sheer didactic fabrications such as Milarepa's towers) need to be questioned, and can be questioned even after we have entered Vajrayāna.

Samaya is not koolaid, though it seem that many people treat it as such. Insitutionally mandated sexism does not need to be a part of Vajrayāna -- this just leads to the ruthless exploitation of women. Justifying it by invoking Machig Labdron is just sad.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

but from a feminist perspective this just doesn't fly.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not fly from the perspective of basic human decency. The minute that Vajrayāna practice becomes more important than basic human decency, Vajrayāna practice ceases to be Dharma and becomes a mere cult.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

then you aren't critiquing Tibetan culture per se you are criticizing the nature of Vajrayana itself.

Malcolm wrote:

I am ok with that. Vajrayāna can use some criticism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Pero said:

So I really doubt whatever anyone who doesn't respect his teachers says.

Namdrol said:

Of course. But I also would doubt what a teacher who does not respect his students says.

muni said:

Study/listen/reflect.... as much as you can, then find a teacher, I think, this advice once given, shouldn't be underestimated.

Malcolm wrote:

This is no guarantee that the teacher, once found, will be a good one, a qualified one. If that teacher does not measure up to Dharma standards, he or she should be dropped like a hot coal from one's hands.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Pero said:

So I really doubt whatever anyone who doesn't respect his teachers says.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. But I also would doubt what a teacher who does not respect his students says.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 29th, 2012 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Okay. I have one question about samaya. What if the teacher falls into dualistic grasping in a such a way as to buy into a common run of the mill worldly point of view that the student thinks is petty?

Malcolm wrote:

The student should mind his own business.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

YogaDude11 said:

Hey Namdrol, Are you a practitioner of yantra yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

I have practiced it on and off for years, and have been a student of ChNN since 1992.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

heart said:

[

At the best you are interpreting Samaya here, but your interpretation is not in harmony with what I been taught or studied nor with what I have experienced. But I have no energy for this discussion.

/magnus

Namdrol said:

On whether you should stay with a teacher who has acted in a way that is not in accord with Dharma, simply examine page 51 of Buddhist Ethics where it clearly says that one should immediately sever one's relationship with such a person. On whether it is necessarily a breakage of samaya to criticize one's guru, examine the six criteria Kongtrul lists for samaya breakage to exist when criticizing one's guru, page 257. It depends primarily on one's motives.

No one is ever going to feel good about it, but sometimes, for the protection of others, it is necessary.

heart said:

One might wonder what is to be considered in accord with the Dharma when one consider Samaya a social construct?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

I consider non-harming to be the basic criteria of Dharma. For example, it is the commitment of taking refuge in the Dharma.

Samaya is a social construct, and has no meaning outside of that construct. For example, samaya represents a contract between two people, a teacher and a student. But the salient point is that it is a two way contract and the teacher is as obliged to observe these commitments as the student.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Jax said:

I use the Kunje Gyalpo as my root reference regarding original Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

The sgra thal gyur is considered the root tantra of Dzogchen, not the kun byed rgyal po. And, if you take a text critical approach, they were both written around the same time.

For myself personally, I consider man ngag sde more profound in general. As it says in the man sngag sde tantras, sems sde is for intellectuals.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

pemachophel said:

"If so, are we not breaking these samaya's constantly when not in rigpa?"

This is exactly what I have been taught by my Teachers. When an Australian Lama friend once asked H.H. Dudjom Rinpoche what He did when He realized His mind had wandered, His Holiness said He immediately said Vajrasattva mantra.

Malcolm wrote:

These four samayas represent the state of the basis. They cannot be broken.

However, the Rangshar says:

As such, the qualified master
remains in equipoise on the real,
the samaya holder does likewise.

Here samaya holder means the student. Allowing oneself to become distracted is a "breakage" of samaya i.e. one's delusion becomes stronger.

In the DC, rather than Vajrasattva, we would do Guru Yoga. Same meaning, different method.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

heart said:

At the best you are interpreting Samaya here, but your interpretation is not in harmony with what I been taught or studied nor with what I have experienced. But I have no energy for this discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything requires interpretation, Magnus. Even your literalist stance is actually an interpretation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

heart said:

[

At the best you are interpreting Samaya here, but your interpretation is not in harmony with what I been taught or studied nor with what I have experienced. But I have no energy for this discussion.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

On whether you should stay with a teacher who has acted in a way that is not in accord with Dharma, simply examine page 51 of Buddhist Ethics where it clearly says that one should immediately sever one's relationship with such a person. On whether it is necessarily a breakage of samaya to criticize one's guru, examine the six criteria Kongtrul lists for samaya breakage to exist when criticizing one's guru, page 257. It depends primarily on one's motives.

No one is ever going to feel good about it, but sometimes, for the protection of others, it is necessary.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:31 PM
Title: Re: Vajra Hell
Content:

Namdrol said:
You can't really break these samayas since they concern your primordial state, and that is something you cannot break.

N

alpha said:
So these would be more like attributes of the primordial state?

Malcolm wrote:
Correct.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:31 PM
Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience
Content:
YogaDude11 said:
No I have not. But I will be doing that very soon. All i have is the book and the dvds.

Malcolm wrote:
You should understand then that vegetarianism is not required, nor is abstinence.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:12 PM
Title: Re: Vajra Hell
Content:

Namdrol said:
It lists general samaya as the famous four samayas of Dzogchen -- non-existence, singleness, ubuiquity, and natural formation.

N

alpha said:
Are these four samayas upheld only when resting in rigpa?
If so, are we not breaking these samaya's constantly when not in rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:

You can't really break these samayas since they concern your primordial state, and that is something you cannot break.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Namdrol said:

And if you criticize them with a view to protecting others from their mistaken and harmful actions, there is also no fault.

N

Kilaya. said:

How do we decide whether a story about a specific Lama is correct or not, especially when we read it on the internet? I mean, there is no teacher you can't find any critical remarks about somewhere on the internet (including our own teacher).

Malcolm wrote:

How can one decide whether any gossip is correct? You have to go to the source, right?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

I understand these things can be generalized-- but I just have rarely if ever seen any of these tendencies in a number of Tibetan lamas I've had the good fortune to study with-- a good portion from old Tibet, and some of which you and I share. But then, maybe the Nyingmas are a bit different because the monastic system isn't as overarching, and there's a greater proportion of female saints....

Malcolm wrote:

Nyingmapas are every bit as bad as the all the others -- this is a Tibetan cultural issue, not a lineage issue. Tibetans do not have, in their own culture, an idea of civil rights and universal suffrage. This is because Tibetans have not yet rejected the feudal power structures of their past -- in fact, all they have done is export them to west where they survive in extra-governmental organizations -- very much like the papacy preserving the

structures of the Roman Imperium with the Pope as emperor and the college of cardinals representing the senate.

I do not want to paint all Tibetans in a bad light-- they are human beings just as we are, and we like they suffer many faults too that are a result of acculturation. But let's not be blind, shall we?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Jax said:

Samaya etc. pertain to tantric and other lower yantras. Dzogchen is beyond all mind constructed concepts.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not strictly true, Jax. In terms of samaya, the Rigpa Rangshar's interlinear notes clarifies the samaya of the view to realized i.e. non-conceptual prajñā.

It lists general samaya as the famous four samayas of Dzogchen -- non-existence, singleness, ubiquity, and natural formation.

Beyond that however, it also clarifies items constituting the body, speech and mind samayas of a Dzogchen practitioner:

The samaya of the body is abandoning taking life.

The samaya of speech is abandoning lying, calumny and harsh words.

The samaya of mind is not troubling concentration or disturbing the guru's mind.

However, the Rangshar also makes it very clear that the Guru is obliged to follow these samayas listed here, and others as well.

It makes it very clear that that the worst samaya to break is the samaya of the body i.e. not to take life. In other words, like all other Buddhist systems, Dzogchen establishes ahimsa as the most basic standard of conduct for a Dzogchen practitioner.

But the system of samaya in Dzogchen is not the system of samaya of maha and anu. On the other hand, it does not mean we completely ignore these samayas too.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Off the top of my head, I can think of only five Tibetan woman who authored texts prior to the mid-twentieth century -- Yeshe Tsogyal, Machig Labdron, Jomo Menmo, Migyur Paldron (daughter of Terdag Lingpa) and Sera Khandro. There are only four or so significant Indian woman who authored texts too, Siddhirajni, Niguma, Sukhasiddhi, and Laksminkara.

N

Adamantine said:

This is more or less a global thing though Namdrol- - I mean, there were far fewer female authors in Europe or America in the 19th or early 20th century then there has been in the last 60 or so years... let's put things in perspective...

Malcolm wrote:

There have been hundreds of women authors through the ages in the West, especially since the 17th century. On this score, Western culture has a much better score than Indo-Asian culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Have you received transmission from ChNN?

N

YogaDude11 said:

Thanks for the share. Sounds like I am entering some kind of stage of development. I have been observing a vegetarian diet and i have cut out all intoxicants and everything that is not "good" for the body. I have tried to maintain celibacy as well, but I do have the occasional releases, but it seems to be getting more under control as time goes on. No television either, or as little as possible. It also seems that with consistent practice everyday I require much less oxygen on each breath, it is as if though the body just does not need to breathe as often.

From what I have read in the book by ChNN, it says that the resultant qualities of the practice are that the yogi develops "profound contemplation". From what I understand that means very deep meditation. So I do not know if what I am experiencing is profound contemplation or maybe the beginning stages of it?

I have been practicing yantra yoga for maybe a year now. I also do sitting mindfulness on the breath meditation. Lately I have been getting this extremely pleasurable feeling/vibration in the middle of the forehead. When I close my eyes my eyelids become heavy after a few minutes and I have this feeling like someone switched my mind off but I am still there fully present, no thoughts seem to arise. It is quite intoxicating and very pleasurable, to be honest if I did not have other things to do I can prob sit there the whole day and abide in this state. I have read some material on mediation and it seems what i am experiencing is the action of the third eye/ajna chakra. I am not quite sure what exactly I am experiencing, all I know is it feels pretty good. I was wondering if anyone can give some more info or personal experiences perhaps. Thanks!

Konchog1 said:

A step before the First Jhana? Try to spread the feeling throughout your body.

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/ptf/dhamma/sacca/sacca4/samma-samadhi/jhana.html> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

Namdrol said:

But as Jax says, in general samaya as commonly discussed in Tibetan Buddhism circles is just a social construct, a contract between you and a guru.

But what Jax did not say, and what he left out, was that real samaya is the comittment to discovering your own primordial state, and when discovered, maintaining knowledge (rigpa) of that state.

But in Dzogchen there are no specific rules or vows. It is all about being present, aware and working with circumstances.

N

heart said:

Really? I don't agree with that. If you disparage your Guru for example it is impossible to be present and aware at the same time.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on whether someone who has acted as your guru is acting in accordance with the Dharma or not. If they are no, there is not fault in severing one's relationship with them. And if you criticize them with a view to protecting others from their mistaken

and harmful actions, there is also no fault. Look it up, you will find I am correct.

"Guru" is a role, not a person. The role has certain obligations, just as the role "student" has certain obligations. The sooner people sort this out, the better.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Its bullshit. skye dman simple means inferior rebirth, that is all.

Adamantine said:

Ok, but what's your understanding of what that means? Dronma is interpreting it that women don't have capacity for practicing Dzogchen, or Dharma, etc. .

My understanding is that it means there are greater obstacles to practicing Dharma. . . and to aspects of life in general-- freedoms, etc.. which is more or less what they were saying. . from a Vajrayana perspective it never meant that women had less capacity than men, that would automatically break a root vow to even use the term then..

Malcolm wrote:

What it has come to mean in the context of Tibetan society is that women are more suited to menial work. Off the top of my head, I can think of only five Tibetan woman who authored texts prior to the mid-twentieth century -- Yeshe Tsogyal, Machig Labdron, Jomo Menmo, Migyur Paldron (daughter of Terdag Lingpa) and Sera Khandro. There are only four or so significant Indian woman who authored texts too, Siddhirajni, Niguma, Sukhasiddhi, and Laksminkara.

The fact is that Tibetan Buddhism is completely patriarchal and sexist -- in fact it is pretty toxic for women in general and is in much need of reform (some of which is happening).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: Don't Let Dharma Reinforce Groupthink

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Adamantine said:

Well if the language changed in dependence on the sanskrit/indian then how that word gained contemporary meaning in the Tibetan society, how it was generally interpreted is another thing.. I believe this is what they are getting at and not just a simple revisionism. Certainly, either way is a generalization.. I am sure some used it in the most derogatory of ways at a given time and context, and some held other views..

Malcolm wrote:

Its bullshit. skye dman simple means inferior rebirth, that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

deepbluehum said:

but the fact is that the samsaric body somehow dissolves into the five lights.

Namdrol said:

Also no.

deepbluehum said:

Now you've really got me on the edge of my seat. I would just love to get a complete thought from you. That would be just too exciting. Honestly. Please, do tell.

Please tell me what happens to channels and physical body when practicing Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Dronma said:

Jilkan, it seems that officially Tibetans do not use the term Dzogchenma. Probably, according to their view about females as being of lower rebirth, they do not even believe that a female can have such capacity for practising Dzogchen.

So, I personally doubt that they use Dzogchenpa for females, either.

Adamantine said:

This is not true, at all. Actually, women are generally considered to have superior spiritual potential than men. The term that we translate into English as "lower birth" according to Gross and Aziz via Judith Simmer-Brown is "not a point of doctrine but an insight from Tibetan Folk wisdom that accurately observes the constrictions and difficulties of a woman's life under patriarchy". Simmer-Brown also points out that this hardship is not looked at in traditional Tibetan understanding as something to lament, but rather something that provides greater recognition of the sufferings of samsara and thus even greater motivation for practicing Dharma. Actually, if you are interested in this issue, as you seem to be, -you should read Judith Simmer-Brown's book "The Dakini's Warm Breath: The Feminine Principle in Tibetan Buddhism" and specifically the chapter on gender in traditional Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Wonderful feminist revisionism — the term "skye dman" is a direct translation from Sanskrit i.e. jātihīna, and far from reflecting Tibetan folk wisdom, merely perpetuates the patriarchal oppression of women.

The pre-Buddhist name for women in Tibet is "sman mo" literally "good woman" where the sman, which also means medicine, has the connotation of "goodness".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

deepbluehum said:

but the fact is that the samsaric body somehow dissolves into the five lights.

Malcolm wrote:

Also no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Very Amazing Experience

Content:

deepbluehum said:

Dzogchen transforms the channels into light.

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

padma norbu said:

I've broken samaya and had no idea. My life didn't get any worse than usual.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you didn't break samaya. To break samaya you have to know what you are doing. You have to be aware and not care. You have to be indifferent.

But as Jax says, in general samaya as commonly discussed in Tibetan Buddhism circles is just a social construct, a contract between you and a guru.

But what Jax did not say, and what he left out, was that real samaya is the commitment to discovering your own primordial state, and when discovered, maintaining knowledge (rigpa) of that state.

But in Dzogchen there are no specific rules or vows. It is all about being present, aware and working with circumstances.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Books and Study Materials on Tibetan Medicine

Content:

Nangwa said:

Tibetan Buddhist Medicine and Psychiatry by Terry Clifford.

Early in the book is a very interesting discussion of how Vajrayana Buddhism greatly influenced and contributed to the sophistication of ayurveda in India.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the opposite way actually. Ayurveda contributed to the development of annutarayoga tantra completion stage practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Vajra Hell

Content:

pemachophel said:

Namdrol,

You will know what?

- A) That you broke samaya
- B) The awakened state beyond pain and suffering

Malcolm wrote:
That you broke samaya.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 12:58 AM
Title: Re: Vajra Hell
Content:
pemachophel said:
Jax,

Your theory sounds good. Recognize the suffering as empty and it's all good. However, in my experience, if you break samaya, you will experience suffering and you won't recognize. :

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is not how it is explained in texts. When you break samaya, you will know.

However, when it comes to samaya, common human decency trumps all and any contracts with gurus. In other words, if you have to break "samaya" to act with common decency, pick common decency.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 28th, 2012 at 12:55 AM
Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"
Content:

Jikan said:
I'm still unclear on something after reading this thread through.

Is it acceptable grammatically to refer to a woman who practices the Great Perfection as a Dzogchenpa? is that normal usage?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pero said:

What is a jenang again? I forgot.

Nangwa said:

Its just a shorter kind of empowerment that is thought of as being a permission giving ritual.

Usually takes between an hour and half or so to three hours, whereas a full wang (at least in Sakya and Gelug) can take a day or two to complete.

Malcolm wrote:

Permissions do not contain the full four empowerments. They contain only a a body, speech and mind blessing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Translating "Dzogchenpa"

Content:

Dronma said:

Then I was surprised to discover that some men are denying the female gender of Tibetan language, and they like to equate it with English, which has no gender in nouns and adjectives.

Malcolm wrote:

No one did that. However, some people, who lack expertise in Tibetan, like making up "Tibetan" words.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: the matter of life and death

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

]And at the end of the Mahapralaya is when the Basis begins to stir signifying the beginning of a Mahakalpa (?)

.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Then of course there is also the question how many Yidams one actually need to practice as a Dzogchen practitioner?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is none. Zero.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 27th, 2012 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

But I cannot see the reason why I have to bow down to anyone who says something without providing any reliable source.

Malcolm wrote:

You do not. But you do need to learn a language before you start having many opinions about it.

As it so happens, I am one of the first batch of doctors who graduated from Shang Shung Institute, and I really do know Tibetan quite well.

The nature of language is that it changes, sometimes its influences are natural evolution from within; sometimes, like with so called "sngags ma", words are coined by outsiders that then become adopted.

For example, many people are not aware that mkha' 'gro really means ḍāka, the male; while mkha' 'gro ma means ḍākinī, the female. But in personal names the "ma" is general left off.

So, what I am trying to say is that while constructions like "rdzogs chen ma" might be possible, they are non-idiomatic, that is -- Tibetans never use these terms in their daily speech nor in their formal writing.

Also Tibetans are not, at this point, sensitive about political correctness in terms of gender use in speech. They still commonly refer to woman as "skye dman", lower rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

pemachophel said:

In Jamgon Kongtrul's Knowing One Liberates All, He says it usually takes six months of recitation retreat (when going by time) to accomplish a given Deity. However, each sadhana typically spells out how many mantra (when going by number) one should expect to recite before achieving accomplishment. In most of the sadhanas I am familiar with, the recitations are divided into three stages: nyen-pa (approach [familiarization]), drub-pa (accomplishment), and lay-jor (activity), with each stage/mantra being said a certain number of times. A general rule for nyen-pa is to say the root mantra 100,000 times for each syllable with possibly another 100,000 for good measure, i.e., to make up any deficiencies. However, in the Paltrul sung-gyud (Paltrul Rinpoche's lineage of Longchen Nyingthig [as, for instance, carried on by Kyabje Chatral Rinpoche]), one typically does 11% over and beyond what the text stipulates. So, if the text says 100,000, the practitioner does 111,111. I agree with Dechen Norbu that it usually takes serious time and effort doing the root mantra before being able to make the activity mantra really work. I have also heard one Lama say (on several occasions) that reciting more than just a few of the activity mantra before having done the requisite nyen-pa and drub-pa is a breach of samaya that can shorten the Teacher's life. If that is true, then I think it goes without saying that it would also be bad for/dangerous to the sadhaka that did so.

Malcolm wrote:

This is definitely not what ChNN says to his students in general. Quality is far more important than quantity. One week of high quality is much better than months of low quality recitation in terms of quantity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: the matter of life and death

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not necessarily, they revert to the basis.

Lhug-Pa said:

So this is what happens for them at the end of a Kalpa or Mahakalpa.... What about at the end of a Pralaya or Mahapralaya?

Malcolm wrote:

They revert to the basis at the end of the mahakalpa. The dissolution of the universe, pralaya, happens between great eons.

Lhug-Pa said:

Do Buddhas who have not reached full enlightenment fall into ignorance again?

Malcolm wrote:

No, there are no buddhas or sentient beings in the basis, there is no falling into ignorance per se, since there is no ignorance in the basis either. In any event, this type of cosmology is useless for most people's practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 12:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

So, Namdrol was wrong when he said: "For example, all women from Eastern Tibet are Khampas, there is no term "Khamma" for eastern Tibetan women".

Malcolm wrote:

Well no, not really. While one can construct such a term, there is no word "kham mo" in any Tibetan dictionary.

There is a word "kham pa" which is defined as "kham kyi yul mi" i.e. a person of the region of Kham -- this term covers all persons from Kham.

But anyway, I am not going to waste my time arguing with you about a language I read fluently.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: the matter of life and death

Content:

Ryoto said:

Arhats, praytyekabuddhas, bodhisattvas are not fully enlightened buddhas. And in Vajrayana, those buddhas on the 11th and 12th bhumis are considered not fully awakened.

Thanks for your reply. Just to clear up the confusion are saying that these Arhats, Praytyekabuddhas, and Bodhisattvas all revert back to ignorance after the destruction of the universe?

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily, they revert to the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

So, what happens with Naljorpa and Naljorma? Do they also reflect assignments in Sanskrit? [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 26th, 2012 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Five Mountain Zen Order & Paul Lynch

Content:

jrzen said:

Especially since Foster is gone.

Malcolm wrote:

He is not just gone, he has gone beyond apparently, having become the 81st Ancestor of Zen.

<https://prajnaInstitute.org/faculty/myogak-foster/> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2012 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Sugatagarbha : Gelugpa & Nyingma

Content:

Mariusz said:

Kagyu one of the best known Third Karmapa Rangjung Dorje elaborates it:

Likewise,

once the adventitious stains—or, more personally speaking, we as sentient beings—have dissolved, it is a moot question whether “our” dharmadhātu (or buddha nature) and “all the rest” of the dharmadhātu (or the buddha natures of all Buddhas) are the same or different, since what is called a sentient being is nothing but the very mistakenness that makes up such a distinction.

p.101:

Malcolm wrote:
Correct.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2012 at 10:07 PM
Title: Re: the matter of life and death
Content:

padma norbu said:

That's what I thought until I read Namdrol's post and when I asked him if the Buddhas are destroyed, too, his response was not quite as definite as yours. He said something like "what does it matter?" which suggested to me that, even if that is the case, there's no point struggling against reality, it's still the best option out there. Sorry, I don't have the thread bookmarked.

dakini_boi said:

That's funny, I think I read in another of Namdrol's posts that fully enlightened buddhas will not revert to samsara even after the destruction of the universe. Think about it, if buddhahood is not permanent, then a buddha's reality would be samsara, by definition. So there would be nothing other than sentient beings of the 6 realms. Therefore there would be no buddha. I tend to take this on faith, that buddhahood is possible and that it is permanent, because otherwise. . . it's just too depressing

Ryoto said:

So you're saying there is such a thing as not fully enlightened Buddhas? One is either a fully enlightened Buddha or not. There is no in between.

Is this some Dzogchen teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats, praytyekabuddhas, bodhisattvas are not fully enlightened buddhas. And in Vajrayana, those buddhas on the 11th and 12th bhumis are considered not fully awakened.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2012 at 9:54 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu
Content:

Dronma said:

So, for clearing up my query, can we say - for example - that Ayu Khandro was a Dzogchenma?

Is it correct from the point of Tibetan language? ?[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not correct as there is no word in tibetan རྒྱལ་ཆེན་མ་.

As Adamantine says, Tibetans reflect gender assignations in Sanskrit with pa and ma, but these do not necessarily apply to Tibetans terms themselves.

If you want to read about the gender of Tibetan words there is a book by Steven Beyer, The Classical Tibetan Language, that explains this very well i.e. when pa and ma are gender signs, and when they are not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 25th, 2012 at 9:01 AM

Title: Re: the matter of life and death

Content:

padma norbu said:

That's what I thought until I read Namdrol's post and when I asked him if the Buddhas are destroyed, too, his response was not quite as definite as yours. He said something like "what does it matter?" which suggested to me that, even if that is the case, there's no point struggling against reality, it's still the best option out there. Sorry, I don't have the thread bookmarked.

dakini_boi said:

That's funny, I think I read in another of Namdrol's posts that fully enlightened buddhas will not revert to samsara even after the destruction of the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

What I said was that fully awakened buddhas never revert to the basis, as opposed to all those with lesser or no realization.

The basis however possesses compassion, so whenever there are sentient beings, buddhas appear. But the division between samsara and nirvana is merely the deluded vision of sentient beings. There is no samsara and nirvana in the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: 2 Karmapas: Let's avoid any hostility

Content:

sherabpa said:

It does not follow that there could not ever be two Karmapas at any point in time.

Malcolm wrote:
Politics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2012 at 11:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

I asked about the Tibetan language!

So, like Naljorpa and Naljorma, Nagpa and Nagma, it might be Dzogchenpa and Dzogchenma or Dzogchenmo - as pensum suggested.

If somebody has accurate knowledge of this, I'd appreciate a lot an accurate grammatical response! [/color]

Malcolm wrote:

"sngags ma" is a western neologism that has been adopted by Tibetans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 24th, 2012 at 11:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Dronma said:

I'd like to bring this question to the surface of the board again, since it was buried by many posts.

So, from the replies it seems that "Dzogchenpa" is a qualified, serious practitioner of Dzogchen. Isn't it?

Then, what is the term for the female Dzogchen practitioner?

Dzogchenmo or Dzogchenma?

Pero said:

Perhaps there isn't one. The -pa doesn't necessarily indicate the male gender wherever you see it. In this case I think it simply means someone who is in the state of dzogchen.

Dronma said:

I think that -pa indicates the gender.

I'd like a response from someone who really knows.

Malcolm wrote:

ཁོ་ is a nominalizer. It does not necessarily indicate gender. For example, all women from Eastern Tibet are Khampas, there is no term "Khamma" for eastern Tibetan women.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Sentient beings are deluded about the display of the basis. When they cease to be so deluded, they are buddhas.

The basis never displays as anything other than the five lights.

gad rgyangs said:

so you're saying sentient beings and buddhas are the display of a different basis? you're saying that sentient beings and buddhas are not included in "all phenomena of samsara and nirvana"? you seem to be claiming there is the basis and its display, on the one hand, and then there's sentient beings and buddhas, but they have nothing to do with each other. if this were so, in what way would the basis be "our real nature"?

Malcolm wrote:

I like the way you systematically misrepresent what I am saying.

read what I said above, and you will see how much your statement purporting to represent what I said, does not represent it, much in the same way that a man with jaundice persistently sees white as yellow.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Dronma said:

Much Ado About Nothing!

The whole topic has been mutated to a personal controversy between gad rgyangs and Namdrol.

asunthatneversets said:

What seems like personal controversy on this thread is more like a resurfacing battle which originates from an epic and ancient war spanning eons of thread. We may never see the end of it, but know that you'll learn some interesting things and gain valuable insight while it goes on. It never sleeps and it cannot be stopped... Resistance is futile!

Malcolm wrote:

No personal controversy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Therefore, are sentient beings and their delusion part of the display of the basis? check, and mate.

Malcolm wrote:

Sentient beings are deluded about the display of the basis. When they cease to be so deluded, they are buddhas.

The basis never displays as anything other than the five lights.

Further, The Luminous Space states:

That mind is produced out of the dualistic grasping
to the six objects of the manifestation of wisdom.

How can that [mind] be produced? Since [the mind] is produced from that ignorance
that does not recognize the intrinsic manifestation of wisdom [the mind] is produced.

Sentient beings, rocks and trees are assembled by delusion about the basis. But the
basis only displays one way. It does not display as both samsara and nirvana.

Since that critical point of luminous empty vidyā was not recognized, grasping onto that
produced the five elements, and the causal thigle [was produced] from the refined part
of those. The body was produced from that [refined part] and energy [rtsal] of wisdom
produces the five sense gates in that [body]. Within those [sense gates] the five
wisdoms are produced. The five [sense gates] grasping onto those [five wisdoms
produce] the five afflictions. After first being created by the energy of wisdom; in the
middle, it was not recognized that the body of the refined part of the assembled
elements actually is the five wisdoms, since this was not realized through intellectual
views, the non-sentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it. Here, it is actually
five wisdoms to begin with; in the middle, when the body is formed from assembly of
the elements through ignorance grasping onto those [five wisdoms] also, it is actually
the five wisdoms. The five aggregates, sense organs, and afflictions also are actually the
five wisdoms. In the end, since one transcends accepting, rejecting, proofs, and
negations since those are realized to be real. As such, the sign of non-duality is [the
body] disappearing into wisdom without any effluents because the critical point of the
non-duality or sameness of the non-sentient and the sentient was understood
according to the Guru's intimate instruction.

The basis only is the five wisdom and only displays the five wisdoms -- the rest is
delusion. Ignorance [avidyā] is not a display of the basis, it is delusion about the display

of the basis. Knowledge is not a display of the basis, it is the absence of delusion about the display of the basis.

One basis, two paths, two results.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 20th, 2012 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the reason why we disagree about this is because you have already forgotten the last thread where this was decided once and for all. I will copy the crucial citation:

Malcolm wrote:

"In brief, those delusions also are not delusion that exist in the cause and basis, but as one does not understand the actual state of the basis one is stubbornly deluded about one's appearances. For example when grasping to a seeming appearance that does not exist in the material, a rope appears to be a snake. Like a conch shell appearing yellow, the actual state of the basis has not been understood, and there is fixated delusion about one's appearances."

-- Khandro Nyinthig

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Instead of complaining more about things not going well for me, how about I offer something potentially helpful here....

It's funny that I said:

A happy song for sure.

As I'm thinking that the song in question might be from the following CD (?):

http://www.snowlionpub.com/html/product_9636.html

About offerings:

In

[url=http://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=6203&start=60#p73628]Guardians of the Teaching,[/url] Namdrol said:

When you do medium thun for example, it is sufficient to visualize offerings. If you want to set them up, that is ok too. Whatever you have space and time for.

In general, there are only two things that you need for offerings (apart from the Ganapuja), according to my understanding of ChNN's intent: light and incense, and even these are not absolutely required.

If you like setting out water offerings, sense offering, medicine and blood, tormas and so on -- go for it -- but it is not absolutely necessary. After all, the universe is a torma according to the torma tantra.

Lhug-Pa said:

Therefore in regard to working with circumstances, in my case I currently cannot burn incense where I live, so if I were to offer Sang and Serkyem, I would have to take Sang incense and try to distill into an essential oil in order to use in my essential oil diffuser (whenever performing a Puja, I at least try to diffuse essential oil, even if it's just some Sage oil or something that I have on hand).

Malcolm wrote:

You can just use juniper essential oil.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Mariusz said:

Moreover, I pointed-out you the seeming is not totally faulty here again, after I wrote your statement "the relative truth is totally faulty" in Academic Discussion forum when we discussed Madhyamaka. So it is only for you, not for me. As long as for you "the relative truth is always faulty" I recognize your view as nihilistic So I use here the dependent nature of Yogacara as one another antidote for your statement.

Malcolm wrote:

What I actually said that was "relative truth is the object of a mistaken cognition", "ultimate truth is the object of an unmistaken cognition". These are Candrakirti's definitions and not mine.

Further, Candra devotes a number of verses to refuting the dependent nature -- read them.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 10:03 PM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:

Lhug-Pa said:
If Being in the State of Dzogchen Contemplation is equivalent to proper Recognition of the Basis & Its display; then in that moment of Contemplation, all Vision is a display of the Basis, yes?

Malcolm wrote:
Not exactly.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 8:11 PM
Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka
Content:
Mariusz said:
Where I accept something for me? .

Malcolm wrote:
If you accept the perfected nature, your view is not Madhyamaka. This is why Candrakirti in detail refutes the three natures scheme.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 7:19 PM
Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka
Content:
Namdrol said:
according to tortured late Tibetan exegesis [Mipham or Shakya Chogden]

Mariusz said:
I don't think so it is so. As you see above, I take it by simply using the subject-side perspective instead of object-side perspective. So for me nothing is "out there" existent, non-existent, so on and so fort.

Malcolm wrote:
Right, your view is cittamatra, since you accept the existence of the subjective side ultimately.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: "Location" of mind in Dzogchen

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Its value/use applies mostly to tögal I'm pretty sure

Sönam said:

The crystal canal is not about mind ...

Sönam

asunthatneversets said:

Whatever term you would say the crystal canal concerns is synonymous with what I'm designating as "mind". I don't usually refer to it as mind either, it only warranted that title in the context of this thread to show the wide array and uses of the term "mind". So any deviation in shared view between you and I is going to be merely semantical.

Malcolm wrote:

No -- in this context the mind is physiologically sited in the lungs, and wisdom is sited in the heart. This is one key difference between the common teachings (i.e. mind has no source, no location and no destination when it leaves) and the uncommon teachings (mind has a source, a location and a destination).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the basis manifests as all phenomena of samsara and nirvana. even if you break it down as

basis--->five lights--->recognition&nonrecognition---->samsara&nirvana

its not like what counts as the display stops at some point and then you get something that is ontologically different.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis only displays one way. That display is either properly recognized or not, leading to samsara and nirvana. Neither samsara nor nirvana exist in the basis. But the basis is made up of three wisdoms. Since there is no ignorance in that state to begin with, there can be no ignorance in that state later. This is why we disagree about whether ignorance is a display of the basis or not. The reason why samsaric phenomena are considered originally pure is that they are simply a result of a misapprehensions of the originally pure naturally formed display of the basis. We do not need to manipulate these phenomena in anyway. But we do need to recognize their actual state, both as delusions (the way they are appearing to us (snang lugs)) and the way these apparent phenomena are present in and of themselves (gnas lugs).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 19th, 2012 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I was thinking about this too. what conclusion can be drawn from this fact? some possibilities are: the corpus is inconsistent, or the view operates on many levels which have different descriptions. certainly we must distinguish texts written "from the point of view of the basis" from those written from the point of view of sentient beings. they may appear contradictory because of this difference of perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

In Man ngag sde there are texts which are aimed at explicating tregchö and texts aimed at explicating thögal. The texts explicating the former are almost exclusively about the basis and the view. The text explicating the latter are almost exclusively about the path and meditation. Sems sde for example is also almost exclusively about the basis i.e. the view. klong sde and man ngag sde are more concerned with the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

But wait, I thought there were no mistaken views because it's all the manifestations of the basis?

And thus how can Namdrol be mistaken, since his view is a manifestation of the basis?

gad rgyangs said:

Namdrol and his mistaken view are not a mistake in the sense that he and his mistaken view should never have arisen in the first place, for yes, him and his mistaken view are just an appearance of the basis. what else could they be? even if his view was not

mistaken, he and his view would still be just an appearance of the basis. what else could they be?

so one can entertain mistaken views about the nature of the basis, but thats no more or less a manifestation of the basis than correct views. It leads to a different movie though.

Malcolm wrote:

You're mistaken in assuming that there is no error -- the proof of that is contained within your own statement.

There is a difference between the appearance of the basis, and the error and non-error regarding that apperance. It leads to different movies, just as you say. But the erroneous perception of basis leads to a movie that is desirable to avoid, as Longchenpa states, and the non-erronenous perception leads to a movie that is desirable to see.

Basically, your point of view entails that for you liberation is meaningless. Which is fine, but that is not the point of view of Dzogchen, nor Buddhism as a whole. It may be the point of view of various neo-advaita, pseudo-zen, new age gurus, but not Dzogchen.

You might be able to post this or that citation that you feels defends your perspective, but so can I -- so that is rather pointless. Nevertheless the String of Pearls states:

Having been gripped by the apprehender and apprehended
in the aggregates, elements and gateways,
one remains in samsara itself for a long while,
within the belly of the three realms
one is placed in the prison of name and matter, [352]
bound by the chains of ignorance,
covered with dense black darkness of samsara,
attached to the spicy taste of passion,
one is bound by the noose of confusion,
tormented by the hot fire of hatred,
one's head is covered by pride,
the gates of jealousy are locked,
surrounded by the armies of resentment and so on,
tied about the neck with the noose of apprehender and apprehended,
stuck in the swamp of past traces,
one's hands are shackled with ripened karma,
the mother of karma is joined with her child,
one following the other just like a water wheel,
alternating between good and bad bodies,
born in different forms,
and through heightening one's self-grasping
one sinks to the bottom of the ocean of suffering,
one's heart is grabbed by the goad of the evil destinies,
one binds oneself with the enemy, afflictions.
Fire appears as water to hell beings,

as hunger and thirst to hungry ghosts,
as fog to animals.
the aggregates, gateways and elements appears as the five elements to humans,
those are also pleasurable, painful and neutral,
as weapons and armor to asuras,
and as desirable things to gods.
For example, just like a rapidly spinning fire wheel
one abides continuously in samsara for a long while.
Such various appearances are like seeing a snake in a rope
since what isn't there is held to be there,
both the outer and inner container and contents form,
and if that is investigated, it is a rope,
i.e. the container and contents are already empty
the ultimate with the form of the relative."

The mistake then is seeing as there what isn't there, which is why this tantra, among others uses the rope/snake example. What this tantra is stating is that deluded appearances we see that are predicated in the basis do not exist in the basis and are not appearances of the basis, but rather misapprehensions of the appearance of the basis.

You on the other hand seem to be saying that the basis manifests as sentient beings and the six realms. If this is what you are saying, then you are very far away from the point of view of the great perfection.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

"The essence of mind is an obscuration to be given up. The essence of vidyā is a wisdom to be attained."

--Longchenpa from nam mkha' dri med in the bla ma yang thig

Something did go wrong, the basis was not recognized. This is why there is, as stated in the dgongs pa zang thal teachings, one basis, two paths and two results. If something did not go wrong there would be no need at all for Dzogchen texts to spend thousands of words explaining how delusion and sentient beings arose.

N

gad rgyangs said:

just because there is rigpa and marigpa doesn't mean that one is right and one is wrong.

one (presumably) leads to cessation of suffering and efficacy in aiding beings, and the other leads to a movie full of all kinds of emotions and experiences. but both come from the same basis, and therefore are just as ka dag as that basis. that is why it is our real nature even while we are marigpa-pas. if it wasn't, introduction wouldn't be possible. think about it, buddhas and sentient beings have the same nature, so how could one be the result of "something going wrong?"

Malcolm wrote:

If something had not gone wrong, no introduction would be necessary, and we could all bliss out in the fake Dzogchen proposition that started this thread.

The point is not about whether everything is ka dag and lhun grub. The point is whether that is recognized and the consequences that occur when it isn't.

gad rgyangs said:

so how could one be the result of "something going wrong?"

Malcolm wrote:

Sentient beings are clearly the result of something gone wrong since they result from ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

"The essence of mind is an obscuration to be given up. The essence of vidyā is a wisdom to be attained."

--Longchenpa from nam mkha' dri med in the bla ma yang thig

Something did go wrong, the basis was not recognized. This is why there is, as stated in the dgongs pa zang thal teachings, one basis, two paths and two results. If something did not go wrong there would be no need at all for Dzogchen texts to spend thousands of words explaining how delusion and sentient beings arose.

N

gad rgyangs said:

just because there is rigpa and marigpa doesn't mean that one is right and one is wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it means that one is right and the other is wrong. By definition marigpa is always wrong.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

exactly, but both the "mistaken" and "not mistaken" are appearances of the basis. if you claim otherwise, you are in effect positing a dual ground, or at least a dual display, one for mistaken sentient beings and one for non-mistaken buddhas.

Namdrol said:

No. We already had this conversation before. There is one basis, two paths and two results. Because sentient beings are deluded they perceive the basis in terms of subject and object, etc. Since buddhas are not deluded about the basis they do not have this dualistic conceptual delusion. The basis only presents one way, but it is perceived differently by buddhas and sentient beings. As long as sentient beings are mistaken about the appearances of the basis, for that long they will continue to cycle in samsara.

N

gad rgyangs said:

this kind of dualism vision always has implicit within it the assumption that things should be different from what they are, that somewhere along the way, "something went wrong". Its really no different from the concept of the fall in Judaeo-Christianity. The assumption "something went wrong" leads naturally to the assumption "something needs to be done, to be corrected". I'm sure even you will agree this is not at all the Dzoghchen view. So, if we reject the idea that "something went wrong" and "something needs to be done", then the idea that all phenomena of samsara and nirvana are the display of the basis, including marigpa, makes perfect sense. texts have been cited in the other thread that demonstrate this, no need to haul them out again, but perhaps you should re-read that thread.

Malcolm wrote:

"The essence of mind is an obscuration to be given up. The essence of vidyā is a wisdom to be attained."

--Longchenpa from nam mkha' dri med in the bla ma yang thig

Something did go wrong, the basis was not recognized. This is why there is, as stated in the dgongs pa zang thal teachings, one basis, two paths and two results. If something did not go wrong there would be no need at all for Dzogchen texts to spend thousands of words explaining how delusion and sentient beings arose.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 3:33 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
you're right about the "yes" part, but mistaken otherwise.

Namdrol said:
You are entitled to your opinion.
the basis is the real nature of sentient beings. the gzhi snang can (and is in the texts) subdivided into stages, but that doesn't mean you can say that "before this stage its the appearances of the basis, but after that stage, its not anymore." All I can do is refer again to the citations I gave, which are very clear.
Sentient beings are cognitive errors, that's all. What they are mistaken about is their own nature, which is the basis. When they cease to be mistaken about those appearances, they are buddhas.

N

gad rgyangs said:
exactly, but both the "mistaken" and "not mistaken" are appearances of the basis. if you claim otherwise, you are in effect positing a dual ground, or at least a dual display, one for mistaken sentient beings and one for non-mistaken buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:
No. We already had this conversation before. There is one basis, two paths and two results. Because sentient beings are deluded they perceive the basis in terms of subject and object, etc. Since buddhas are not deluded about the basis they do not have this dualistic conceptual delusion. The basis only presents one way, but it is perceived differently by buddhas and sentient beings. As long as sentient beings are mistaken about the appearances of the basis, for that long they will continue to cycle in samsara.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 3:20 AM
Title: Re: Two approaches.
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
you're right about the "yes" part, but mistaken otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

You are entitled to your opinion.

gad rgyangs said:

the basis is the real nature of sentient beings. the gzhi snang can (and is in the texts) subdivided into stages, but that doesn't mean you can say that "before this stage its the appearances of the basis, but after that stage, its not anymore." All I can do is refer again to the citations I gave, which are very clear.

Malcolm wrote:

Sentient beings are cognitive errors, that's all. What they are mistaken about is their own nature, which is the basis. When they cease to be mistaken about those appearances, they are buddhas.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Now then, you seem to be hard of hearing.

The appearance of the basis does not contain faults. Not recognizing the appearance of the basis is a fault, as the tantra I cited demonstrates.

N

gad rgyangs said:

.....and conveniently ignoring the citations I gave.

Malcolm wrote:

The citations you gave do not contradict what I am saying in the least.

gad rgyangs said:

lets try it this way: "are sentient beings included within appearances of the basis?"

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and no.

No, because there are no sentient beings in the basis and sentient being do not appear when the basis appears. Yes, because the non-recognition of the basis produces sentient beings after the basis appears. Sentient beings, and everything else, is made of the appearance of the five lights of the basis etc. But the five lights of the basis etc are never contaminated by the ignorance that does not recognize the basis for what it is. In this way the proper answer is both yes and no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there isn't a Dzogchen master alive who would say that Longchenpa's writings are anything other than the purest expression of the the Dzogchen view we have. So, I will ignore the snide aspersions being cast upon him here.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually the aspersion was being cast on those who think that it is sufficient to rely on Longchenpa for a well-rounded view of Dzogchen. For example, Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo opines that dgongs pa zang thal teachings are more profound than other nyinthig teachings for this and that reason.

Now then, you seem to be hard of hearing.

The appearance of the basis does not contain faults. Not recognizing the appearance of the basis is a fault, as the tantra I cited demonstrates.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Reigle vs Sparham - Sanskrit

Content:

Will said:

N. - if "dharma-dhātu is the svabhāva of the dharma-dhātu" is correct meaning, then the notion of dharma-dhātu having no svabhāva, ie, being empty of inherent existence, seems impossible. How can dharma-dhātu be both svabhāva & nisvabhāva at once? Is this not a big difference between Mahayana & Hinayana?

Namdrol said:

Since the svabhāva of matter and so on are emptiness, if the svabhāva of matter is emptiness and matter, etc., is also matter and so on are the svabhāva of the dharmadhātu, there is no contradiction

Will said:

Sorry N., but my stupid factor looms larger as the years pass. Please clarify if you are saying that 1) dharma-dhātu has svabhāva or 2) dharma-dhātu has no svabhāva or 3) some other option(s)

Malcolm wrote:

The dharmadhātu has a svabhāva and that svabhāva is dharmas such as matter and so on that lack svabhāva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there is no fault in the basis, therefore, neither is there the possibility of fault in that which proceeds from the basis. in fact, the absence of fault in the basis is what guarantees that there is no possibility of fault in the display.

Malcolm wrote:

No one said there was a fault in the display or in the basis. All that was said was that not recognizing the display for what it is a mistake, a fault, an error.

A tantra called Uprooting Delusion from the dgongs pa zang thal cycle provides the following description:

The way sentient beings arise:

that nameless general ground,
is non-conceptual and not established at all,
invisible and unclear, from which
when the bifurcation occurs,
since vāyu, vidyā, and space separate, [3/b]
the intrinsic sound of the elements produces vibration.
From the inside of the darkness of the clear part of appearances,
as soon as a storm of fire emerges,
scattering everywhere,
Vidyā, like the mind of a lunatic,
is dazed and reeling.
Since vidyā lacks confidence in its own appearances,
it panics at sound, is frightened of rays,
and through awareness not taking its own place,
the ignorance that arises simultaneously with it
is called “the causal ignorance.

Because of a lack of mindful attention,
self and other are grasped as a duality,
and both outer and inner dependent origination occur.
The whole universe arises
through awareness looking externally.
All sentient being arise

through awareness looking internally.
Through looking there, fearful appearances arise,
through looking here, 'self' arises.
Many mistakes arise from the single mistake
about the appearances of here and there.
Because of being mistaken about a self, there is a mistake about other,
attachment to self, aversion to other.
From the seed of attachment and aversion,
the whole outer universe and inhabitants are mistakes.
Because one is held as two, [4/a]
that is called the delusion of dualistic grasping.
Since one imputed and mistook outer and inner,
that is called "the imputing ignorance".
Because of familiarity of subject and object of that,
from the thick buildup of traces,
there was entrance into the state of samsara.
That is how the six migrations occurred."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 18th, 2012 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Mariusz said:

With all respect I did not see it in your quotes. Perhaps prove it with another one please.
All I see is the dependent nature as never existed in the first place although it seems to be, so also not totally faulty.

Namdrol said:

You need to read the Mahayāna Samgraha by Asanga then it will be more clear to you.

N

Mariusz said:

Thanx. Do you know suitable english book on it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is in translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

The appearance of the basis is not a fault; the non-recognition of those appearances is.

gad rgyangs said:

so if you're saying that what should have happened is that "everybody" recognized and abided as samantabhadra, then you're denigrating the basis, saying it can't do anything right, it spits out a display and even that is all messed up with "faults" and mistakes", retarded sems can who don't know any better. what a loser-basis.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no fault in the basis. But not recognizing the basis is a fault.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Bimala

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Thank you guys. One more silly question: how much are you supposed to take? Would one pill per day be enough?

Malcolm wrote:

2

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist ethics and BDSM?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Really, seven pages on bondage? Face it greg, some people like being tied up when they screw, lashed with whips, and otherwise dominated and humiliated, and some people like to do that stuff to others while screwing them, and BDSM is a protocol for doing it relatively safely without it resulting in rape, etc. Is it deluded? Yes. Does it matter? Not much.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Everything can be traced back to non-recognition of the appearance of the basis. That

non-recognition is a mistake. Samsara is a fault because it is the result of an error.

gad rgyangs said:

and what: some part of the appearances of the basis are incompetent?

Malcolm wrote:

The appearance of the basis is not a fault; the non-recognition of those appearances is. That is where samsara comes from. And, as long as you have samsaric vision, karmic vision, you can be sure that you are not seeing the appearances of the basis as they are, but are viewing them through traces of affliction and action. In other words, the gnas lugs, how things are, and snang lugs, how things appear are dissonant because of ignorance., etc.

This is why many fake Dzogchenpas resort to the opposite of Garab Dorje's three words i.e. they introduce as many people as they can to to their own delusion, convince them that delusion is perfectly ok, and they all continue in samsara for ever.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Mariusz said:

With all respect I did not see it in your quotes. Perhaps prove it with another one please. All I see is the dependent nature as never existed in the first place although it seems to be, so also not totally faulty.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read the Mahayāna Samgraha by Asanga then it will be more clear to you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

well said DarwidHalim. The common response to this view is "but if you are still seeing the story, it does no good to say its all dharmakaya/empty/perfect/dzogpachenpo/etc...you have to do the practices...etc". My contention is that it is precisely by understanding why doing practices actually changes nothing at all, that your practices can actually be beneficial. As long as you think they are actually changing anything real, they will not be so effective. that may

seem paradoxical, but there it is. So the people fighting the Dzogchen view tooth and nail (surprisingly many of whom self-identify as students of Dzogchen) are actually doing themselves a disservice, and walking straight away from that which they so vociferously proclaim is necessary, that is, the reduction/elimination of suffering.

heart said:

Practices don't change the natural state, nor make it closer in any way. Practices destroy misunderstanding, intellectualized views and confusion. Our minds are very tricky and deceptive, which is obvious in these threads, and for this reason no matter how many pretty books you read you will never understand the Great Perfection. In all Dzogchen manuals it is written that you should find a qualified teacher and do anything he/she says. I am afraid that is the only way because cleverness will just not make.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Sometimes I think the problem is that people only read Longchenpa, who has a very specific take and they do not read the wider tradition of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 7:15 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Mariusz said:

I also thank you. So it supports my investigation based only on english translation here in my previous posts. Good to see it finally as not the Mind only (Cittamatra), but as Yogacara compatible with Madhyamaka as I wrote earlier

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what Tom is saying. Tom is saying that imagination of the unreal exists. That is precisely the cittamatra POV. If one reads the MV objectively, there is no way to read it as Madhyamaka text. If you read it according to tortured late Tibetan exegesis [Mipham or Shakya Chogden], then you can try, but in doing so you have to basically assert that the perfected nature is never the dependent nature. But in fact in the MV it is made extremely clear that the perfected nature simple is the non-existence of the imagined nature in the dependent nature, and that non-existence exists. In summary, there really is no way to reconcile Maitreyanath's Madhyāntavibhanga and Dharmadharmatāvibhanga with Madhyamaka. They are all Yogacara (cittamatra) treatises meant to explicate the Yogacara tradition sutras such the Samdhinirmocana, the Lanka and so on. This applies also to the the Sutra-alaṃkāra. This also applies to the Uttaratantra. Why? Because the Cittamatras also present a presentation of freedom from reference points i.e. the wisdom exists but it is free from reference points. The Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra is also not free from fault in this respect because it really only discusses the structure of the path. The reason why the Yogacara commentaries of the AA are not widely studied in Tibet is because they are not compatible Madhyamaka view.

Primarily Aryavimuktisena and Haribhadra are studied, both Madhyamaka scholars critical of the Yogacara point of view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 7:04 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

well said DarwidHalim. The common response to this view is "but if you are still seeing the story, it does no good to say its all

dharmakaya/empty/perfect/dzogpachenpo/etc...you have to do the practices...etc".

My contention is that it is precisely by understanding why doing practices actually changes nothing at all, that your practices can actually be beneficial. As long as you think they are actually changing anything real, they will not be so effective. that may seem paradoxical, but there it is. So the people fighting the Dzogchen view tooth and nail (surprisingly many of whom self-identify as students of Dzoghchen) are actually doing themselves a disservice, and walking straight away from that which they so vociferously proclaim is necessary, that is, the reduction/elimination of suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course practices don't change anything real whoever said they did? -- we all know the path is completely illusory from beginning to end, even buddhahood is completely illusory. But this is not a Dzogchen perspective -- this is a perspective from perfection of wisdom sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 6:57 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you can stop cycling in samsara if thats your predilection, its just that samsara is not a "fault" or "mistake". how could anything that arises be a mistake, since everything is ultimately traceable back into the ka dag, lhun grub and thugs rje of the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything can be traced back to non-recognition of the appearance of the basis. That non-recognition is a mistake. Samsara is a fault because it is the result of an error. But there are some people who like this fake Dzogchen approach where they feel that all of the problems they cause themselves and others are "ok" because it is all "original purity and so on. This is little different than the kind of nihilism that some people who misunderstand the perfection of wisdom sutras engage in. So, the next time you are pissed off, or suffering, just try and explain it all away to yourself as the three wisdoms

of the basis and then get back to us on how well that is working out for you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

not sure what "on top of" is meaning here?

Malcolm wrote:

What Khenpo Jigphun is saying is that there is no liberation in the basis, liberation and non-liberation are only valid questions from the point of view of the arising of basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

cycling in samsara is only a fault if your view is dualism.

Malcolm wrote:

Please enjoy yourself then...even though it seems you have utterly missed the point that Dzogchen also just an attempt to solve the Buddhist question of how to stop cycling in samsara.

The answer to that question is not "Cycling in samsara? No problem, please continue...."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there are not really two approaches, because it is by realizing the first that the second is fulfilled.

Longchenpa, in chos dbyings mdzod says "although Buddhahood is timeless, there is

awakening to Buddhahood anew." Basically this means that you can enjoy the ride without sweating it. The awakening anew part is just for fun, the ground/you just playing hide and seek with itself/yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

Khenpo Jigphun points:

"Even though the omniscient guru [Longchenpa] may have stated "Samantabhadra was liberated on the basis", if there is liberation on the basis there be the fault of once again cycling in samsara. Therefore, it is necessary that liberation is on top of the appearance of the basis."

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

Jinzang said:

The nub of the issue is that although buddha mind is ordinary mind (tha mal gyi shes pa), we don't see ordinary mind because of our obscurations. Hence the many expedient means to remove them. In the sense that seeing ordinary mind is quite rare, what is called ordinary is extraordinary.

Malcolm wrote:

tha mal gyi shes pa is just a yogi's word for ye shes i.e. wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth of whom?

Content:

cyndilydia said:

While the organic host has died, it has left the entity charged with properties priming it for the next "rebirth".

I hope this makes sense.

duckfiasco said:

What is hosted by the entity? What is their relationship? What is leaving, where does it go, and what is left behind?

cyndilydia said:

Good questions. In talking things out, I can identify and address holes in reasoning. Let me take a stab..

The entity is that which lives the multiple lifetimes working to nirvana

The host is the organism whose life force is the entity. The host is born, lives and dies. Upon death, the entity is ready to be reborn to another host.

Leaving is death of the host, I don't know where the entity goes - am working on a couple of theories

What is left behind is a carcass

These answers aren't really satisfying. Hopefully it's like writing code for me - I don't know what I'm doing, but when the errors are all fixed, the program works.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no entity that takes rebirth. But there is rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 17th, 2012 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Reigle vs Sparham - Sanskrit

Content:

Will said:

N. - if "dharma are the svabhāva of the dharma-dhātu" is correct meaning, then the notion of dharma-dhātu having no svabhāva, ie, being empty of inherent existence, seems impossible. How can dharma-dhātu be both svabhāva & nisvabhāva at once? Is this not a big difference between Mahayana & Hinayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Since the svabhāva of matter and so on are emptiness, if the svabhāva of matter is emptiness and matter, etc., is also matter and so on are the svabhāva of the dharmadhātu, there is no contradiction

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 16th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Two approaches.

Content:

White Lotus said:

so... we have these two approaches and should be aware that they cannot be reconciled. there have been great masters from many lineages who have emphasised one over the other.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are two approaches:

1) True Dzogchen teachings

2) False Dzogchen teachings (which by definition are not actually Dzogchen, but are various strains of recycled Neo-Zen, Crypto-Advaita, New Age fantasy and so on and so forth).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 16th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Reigle vs Sparham - Sanskrit

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This gentleman's understanding is correct.

Will said:

Anyone competent enough in Sanskrit to understand who correctly translates these verses in the Abhisamayālaṃkāra? This is from this blog - <http://prajnaquest.fr/blog/> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

David Reigle

March 13, 2012 at 5:40 am

Regarding the quotations from Haribhadra's Āloka, rather than my own translations I had intended to give these as translated by Gareth Sparham (Abhisamayālaṃkāra with Vṛtti and Ālokā, 4 vols., Jain Publishing Company, 2006-2012). It is thanks to his English translation that I found these quotations. However, he incorrectly translates these as saying that the dharma-dhātu is the svabhāva of the dharmas, rather than that the dharmas are the svabhāva of the dharma-dhātu. Since this idea is of considerable importance to our research, I will provide some detail.

Gareth was the first (and still the only) person to translate the two primary Indian commentaries on Maitreya's Abhisamayālaṃkāra into English. This small and concise text outlines the path to Buddhahood buried in the large and diffuse Prajñāpāramitā sūtras. Because it gives the whole path to Buddhahood, the Abhisamayālaṃkāra (in Tibetan translation) became the most widely studied text in Tibet. Because of the complexity of this path, the Abhisamayālaṃkāra became the most commented on text in Tibet. Gareth has also translated Tsong kha pa's extensive commentary on it, titled Golden Garland of Eloquence. Gareth's long study of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra and the path it teaches, first with Tibetan lamas from Tibetan texts, and then later from the original Sanskrit texts, has allowed him to translate this complex material into English for us. One must know the technicalities of the system before the texts are comprehensible. One cannot just pick up a text and expect to comprehend it. So we are fortunate to have access to this material through his translations. But of course, in dealing with this vast material, small mistakes are easily made and are to be expected.

Haribhadra's statements usually use the compound, dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatayā, or

dharmā-dhātu-svabhāvatvāt. The suffixes -tā and -tva, basically meaning “-ness” or “-hood,” are very often used in Sanskrit as a quick substitute for the finite verb meaning “is” or “are.” When declined in the instrumental or ablative cases, -tayā or -tvāt, as they are here, they mean “because [something] is [such and such],” more literally, “by being . . .,” or “due to being . . .” These compounds are usually straightforward. Here we have simple tatpuruṣa or case relation compounds. In these, the genitive case ending, meaning “of,” must be supplied for dharmā-dhātu. This gives us “the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharmā-dhātu.” The declined suffixes -tayā or -tvāt then give us “because [they, i.e., dharmas] are the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu.” This is, by the way, fully supported by the Tibetan translations, which supply the elided case endings for these tatpuruṣa compounds. They give chos kyi dbyings kyi ngo bo nyid, supplying the genitive case ending “kyi.”

In order to reverse this meaning, and get that the dharmā-dhātu is the inherent nature of the dharmas, one would have to take this compound as a bahuvrīhi, an adjective. This is apparently what Gareth did. However, this cannot be done. First, since the -tā or -tva suffixes already say that something “is” something, one would not expect these compounds to be bahuvrīhis or adjectives. Second, as a bahuvrīhi or adjective, it must agree in gender and number with the word it modifies. If it describes the dharmas, these words must agree; but they do not. What we have is dharmas in the masculine genitive plural, dharmāṇām (or rūpādīnām), while the compound ending in -tayā is feminine singular and the compound ending in -tvāt is neuter singular. If this compound was a bahuvrīhi or adjective (which it is not), it could be translated as “they whose svabhāva is the dharmā-dhātu,” or “having the dharmā-dhātu as svabhāva.” This is apparently how Gareth got his translations. The Tibetan translations also rule this out. To take this compound as a bahuvrīhi or adjective means to take the underlying compound as a karmadhāraya rather than as a tatpuruṣa, while the Tibetan translations show it as a tatpuruṣa.

This phrase, dharmāṇām dharmā-dhātu-svabhāvatayā (or -svabhāvatvāt), means literally, “of the dharmas, because of the being the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu.” This, in English, is a very convoluted way of saying, “because the dharmas are the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu.” This Sanskrit phrasing is very common, especially in prose commentaries on verse works. It was not until years into my Sanskrit studies (mostly reading verses) that I figured out how to translate this prose phrase. No Sanskrit textbook known to me explains it. To get idiomatic English, one must take the word declined in the genitive case as the subject, take the -tā or -tva suffix as the verb “is/are,” place the “because” at the very beginning (given at the very end of the Sanskrit by the instrumental or ablative case ending), and then bring in what the -tā or -tva suffix is attached to. Thus, “because (instrumental “ayā” of “ā”) the dharmas (dharmāṇām) are (-tā) the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu (dharmā-dhātu-svabhāva).” This also works when the word having the -tā or -tva suffix is declined in the nominative rather than the instrumental or ablative cases. One merely leaves out the “because.” Thus, rūpādīnām mahattā: literally, “of form, etc., [there is] greatness”; idiomatically, “form, etc., are (-tā) great.” When the “subject” in the genitive case is not stated, one may supply a pronoun, “it” or “they.” Thus, dharmā-dhātu-svabhāvatvāt: “because it is (or they are) the inherent nature of the dharmā-dhātu.”

Besides the instrumental -tayā and the ablative -tvāt, we also have the suffix -tva declined in the instrumental case, -tvena. In theory -tvena should have the same meaning as the instrumental -tayā (and the ablative -tvāt), “because (it/they) is/are,” but in practice -tvena more often means “as being” (or simply, “as”). Sometimes a phrase using -tvena is found along with a phrase using -tvāt. Then the -tvena phrase may be subordinated to the -tvāt phrase. Thus, sarva-dharmāṇāṃ dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvena rāgārāga-viviktatvāt: literally, “of all dharmas, as being the inherent nature of the dharma-dhātu, because they are distinct from desire and non-desire.” For idiomatic English, we may place the “because” of the -tvāt phrase first, make the genitive the subject, then insert the subordinate -tvena phrase, and then complete the -tvāt phrase. Thus, “because all dharmas, as being the inherent nature of the dharma-dhātu, are distinct from desire and non-desire.” This explanation of the Sanskrit construction of these phrases is an aside, hopefully useful for Sanskrit students. The translation problem being referred to in this note specifically pertains to the construal of just the compound, not to the construal of the whole phrase.

With the help of Gareth’s translation, I have taken note of nine places in Haribhadra’s text where this statement is made. Here is a listing of these places, along with his translations. My additions are given in double brackets. The single brackets and parentheses are his. His translations are followed by the Sanskrit text, with references to both Unrai Wogihara’s 1932 edition, Abhisamayālaṃkāṛālokā, and to P. L. Vaidya’s 1960 edition, Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā. Then given are translations that are as literal as I could make them in keeping with English idiom, so that the Sanskrit text can be more easily followed and compared.

1. Sparham, vol. 1, p. 304: “And why? Subhūti says, Because a Bodhisattva is as boundless as form, etc., is boundless. Based on the maxim, ‘There is no dharma over and above the dharma element [[dharma-dhātu]],’ just as the dharma element is boundless, so too is the form [skandha], etc., that has that for its essential nature [[svabhāva]] boundless.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 110, lines 3-4, Vaidya p. 323, line 1: . . . dharma-dhātuvat tat-svabhāvi-bhūtānāṃ yasmād rūpādīnāṃ aparyantatayā bodhisattvāparyantatā . . . Reigle: “. . . like the dharma-dhātu, because form, etc., which are its inherent nature (svabhāva), are boundless, bodhisattvas are boundless . . .” (I have not translated yasmād here, because it correlates with tasmād later in the sentence).

2. Sparham, vol. 2, p. 124: “Here [Maitreya] is saying that form and so on [[the dharmas]] are great because the Dharma Element [[dharma-dhātu]] is their final nature (svabhāva).” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 176, line 3, Vaidya p. 349, line 15: etad uktam | rūpādīnāṃ dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatayā mahattā. Reigle: “This is what was said: Form, etc. [the dharmas], are great, because they are the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu.”

3. Sparham, vol. 2, p. 130: “[Maitreya] is saying [the gods say a Bodhisattva] standing in that [Perfection of Wisdom] is certain that the form [skandha] and so on with the Dharma Element [[dharma-dhātu]] as its essential nature [[svabhāva]] is the Tathāgata.”

Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 182, lines 11-12, Vaidya p. 351 lines 15-16: etad uktam | prajñā-pāramitāyāṃ sthitasya vastuno dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatayā rūpādīnāṃ tathāgatavādhāraṇam iti. Reigle: “This is what was said: For something established in the Perfection of Wisdom, tathāgatahood (buddhahood) is ascertained, because form, etc., are the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu.”

4. Sparham, vol. 2, p. 134: “[Maitreya] is saying [the gods are saying] that all dharmas have the Dharma Element [[dharma-dhātu]] as their essential nature [[svabhāva]], . . .” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 185, lines 21-23, Vaidya p. 353, lines 10-11: etad uktam | dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatayā prajñā-pāramitāyāṃ sthitasya bodhisattvasya sarva-dharmāṇāṃ nodgraha-tyāga-bhāvanādikam iti. Reigle: “This is what was said: For a bodhisattva established in the Perfection of Wisdom there is no cultivation, etc., of the taking up or abandoning of all dharmas, because they are the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu.”

5. Sparham, vol. 2, p. 241: “. . . a wholesome root . . . and has the same own-being [[svabhāva]] because its own-being is the Dharma Element [[dharma-dhātu]].” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 350, lines 23-25, Vaidya p. 391, lines 18-19: . . . dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvāt tat-svabhāvam. Reigle: “. . . [has] the inherent nature (svabhāva) of that, because it is the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu.”

6. Sparham, vol. 3, p. 138: “He means that in true reality form, etc., its sign, and its own-being [[svabhāva]] are the Dharma Element, and the practice that therefore does not conceive, etc., of them enables [Bodhisattvas] to gain non-conceptual practice and not construct [or conceive of] powers that are ‘unthinkable,’ i.e., beyond thought.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 479, lines 1-2, Vaidya p. 425, line 8: tattvato dharma-dhātu-rūpatvād rūpādi-tan-nimitta-tat-svabhāvāvikalpanādi-pratipatti-sāmarthyena . . . Reigle: “In reality, because it is the form of the dharma-dhātu, through the capability of the practice of non-conception, etc., of form, etc., which are the sign of that and the inherent nature (svabhāva) of that, . . .”

7. Sparham, vol. 4, p. 196: “All dharmas have the Dharma Element for their own-being [[svabhāva]], [i.e., essential nature], so you cannot get at any other different suchness dharma. Since this is the case, ultimately, no one stands in suchness.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 859, lines 14-16, Vaidya p. 517, lines 14-15: dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvāt sarva-dharmāṇāṃ tathatā-vyatiriktānya-dharmānupalambhe sati naiva kaścit paramārthatas tathatāyāṃ sthāsyati. Reigle: “Because all dharmas are the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu, there being no perception of other dharmas distinct from suchness, no one ultimately will stand in suchness.”

8. Sparham, vol. 4, p. 228: “To remove the conceptualization of a nominal (prajñapti) being, [they should meditate] on the fact that, because all dharmas have, in their original nature, the Dharma Element as own-being [[svabhāva]], they are isolated from a shared or specific place.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 898, lines 4-5, Vaidya p. 527, lines 27-28: sattva-prajñapti-vikalpa-nirāsārtham sarva-dharmāṇāṃ prakṛtyā dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvena sāmānya-viśiṣṭa-deśa-viviktatvāt. Reigle: “This is for the sake of removing the conceptualization of the designation of a being, because all dharmas, as

naturally being the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu, are distinct from a common or specific place.”

9. Sparham, vol. 4, p. 229: “To remove the conceptualization of attachment, [they should meditate] on the fact that all dharmas are isolated from attachment and non-attachment because they have as their own-being [[svabhāva]] the Dharma Element.” Sanskrit, Wogihara p. 898, lines 20-21, Vaidya p. 528, lines 2-3: sakti-vikalpa-nirāsārtham sarva-dharmāṇāṃ dharma-dhātu-svabhāvatvena rāgārāga-viviktatvāt. Reigle: “This is for the sake of removing the conceptualization of attachment, because all dharmas, as being the inherent nature (svabhāva) of the dharma-dhātu, are distinct from desire and non-desire.”

Note: I sent this to Gareth before posting it, and he very graciously encouraged me to go ahead and post it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 16th, 2012 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Tom said:

Here it says that abhūta parikalpa is the dependent nature, not imagined nature which is said to correspond to the object.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. The "imagination of the unreal" is a single entity. However it contains content i.e. the unreal.

Some people seem to think that that it ought to be translated as "unreal imagination", as if the imagination itself in question is unreal. I do not think this is correct. Unreal is not an adjective of the imagination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 5:27 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Tom said:

It seems to contradict verse 1:5.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see how.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Tom said:

Why do you divide these two components into the real and unreal? I can't see this in the text.

Malcolm wrote:

The imagination of the unreal exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

Tom said:

Just to be clear in "1) The imagination is the dependent." you mean imagination of the unreal "abhūta parikalpa," not imagination "parikalpita svābhava", yes?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Tom said:

I only ask because of the context of the next verse (1:5).

Also, given verse 1:9 how do you conclude that the ālayavijñāna is equated with the imagination of the unreal?

Malcolm wrote:

Verse nine describes the imagination (the ālayavijñāna) of the unreal (the other seven consciousness).

You seem to think that all eight are the unreal. This is not the intention of 1:8-9.

Tom said:

Are you translating from the Tibetan? or are you using someone else's translation?

Malcolm wrote:

I generally translate directly from Tibetan, if not I give citation of source.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Veganism

Content:

Namdrol said:

Not better, just different. Native Americans heavily altered the environment of North America to suit themselves.

gregkavarnos said:

Better and different. If one compares the environment, and the human life styles impact on it, in Europe to those in North America in the period prior to the full scale invasion and some time into it, you would be hard pressed not to consider them better, superior, more sustainable, less destructive, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

You forget that when Europeans first came to New England, Columbus had already introduced most of the western diseases that had completely depopulated North America by 90 percent, according to some estimates.

And, you forget the Mayans basically destroyed their civilization through not understanding environmental limitations.

You are basically making an argument that stone-age is better than copper or iron age. In reality, Indians loved guns. Couldn't get enough of them. Much better than arrows. More efficient at bagging game. If NA has not been depopulated by smallpox and so on, I think we would have a very different assessment of what kind of an impact Indians had on the land.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 15th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Does he say why?

(I think the teacher who said the comment I alluded to earlier was Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche, but as I'm not 100% sure...)

Malcolm wrote:

For integration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2012 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

catmoon said:

I do have to wonder though, if alcohol consumption was a regular thing in the very early

Sangha, how on earth did they manage to meditate? A couple of drinks and I'm out of the meditation game for 24 hours. Four or five and I'm out for 3 or 4 days.

Dechen Norbu said:

There are people who meditate very well after a sip. Not my case either. I can't even convince myself to drink a glass of red wine during meals, even if I know it would be great for my health. I get very lazy only by drinking a little.

Still, there was a teacher who even said that meditation went better after a martini (a small glass of vermouth... but I'm sure it doesn't matter), perhaps because some people tend to be very uptight when they start their formal practice (too much formality perhaps). But that comment was made in a specific context and under particular conditions. So it's better not to generalize it.

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Rinpoche recommends in one retreat manual that one should have a drink every day while in retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Veganism

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

But the topic of this discussion was their relationship to the animals they hunted and consumed (and if we stretch it a bit, to their environment in general). It would be very difficult to convince me that it was not (and still is to a degree) infinitely better than European attitudes and relationships.

Malcolm wrote:

Not better, just different. Native Americans heavily altered the environment of North America to suit themselves.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2012 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

PS I do not consider wine with meals covered.

Can we stretch this one to cover beer and crisps or whiskey and peanuts?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. That depends on one's capacity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 14th, 2012 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think the mods have dealt quite well with a variety of individuals that come here merely to stir trouble.

Namdrol said:

I doubt that Jax has come here for the purpose of causing trouble. I don't agree with how he discusses the teachings and his point of view seems perennialist -- he does not strike me as a "troublemaker" per se.

N

Mr. G said:

Namdrol, are you saying you think he should not have been banned? If so, do you have suggestions on how to best objectively qualify in the future whether a member should, or should not be banned? To me, his claims of accomplishing the result of gtum mo, lack of respect towards his own Dzogchen teachers, repeatedly openly discussing the specifics of inner practices involving channels, gazing, etc., and bizarre statements blending advaita, Dzogchen and Gnostic teachings had me label him as a disruptive troll. Was I too quick to act? Is there better criteria to be used in the future?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not going to second guess the admin's decisions.

However, what he said regarding Gnostic blah blah blah has been said by John Reynolds.

As far as lack of respect of his teachers goes, that is his problem, not ours.

As far as talking about the specifics of thögal openly, this is not the correct way -- but it was corrected.

We have many people who say strange things here. It is to be expected. I think the main thing that bothered people was that he does not care about lineage and that he has some odd ideas about transmission.

So, whether you choose to readmit him or not, I think that most of what you outline above is not really something we ought to ban people for.

Most of us here understand the right way. We also do not want a repeat of E-Sangha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Why the Buddha banned booze.

Content:

Seishin said:

Are we talking about for montastics only?

Huseng said:

The five lay precepts include a prohibition on alcohol as well, so yes it includes everyone, not just monastics.

Malcolm wrote:

The point in general is intoxication, not alchohol. I do not consider wine with meals covered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

I think the mods have dealt quite well with a variety of individuals that come here merely to stir trouble.

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt that Jax has come here for the purpose of causing trouble. I dont agree with how he discusses the teachings and his point of view seems perennialist -- he does not strike me as a "troublemaker" per se.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Censorship on This Forum

Content:

Jacks said:

Debate has the function of bringing out unsupported notions that cant survive the light of day. More importantly, great debate can be lots of fun!

Malcolm wrote:

Well for example, your notion that Dzogchen is an affirming negation turns out to be

completely unsupported by the primary texts of the system. But that does not require debate, that merely requires reading the texts themselves.

In general, we find that in many Dzogchen texts the twin terms dgag and sgrub are used -
- dgag means to refute, sgrub means to prove. The essence of debate is refutation and proof, rejecting one point of view and accepting another point of view. But in reality, as Rongzom Chozang points out, the state of Dzogchen is beyond both refutation and proof. This is why I continue to insist that it is waste of time to debate about Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Censorship on This Forum

Content:

Jinzang said:

Debate is just conceptual grasping itself.

Then spending time on forums is a waste, yes?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not necessarily. But I find debate singularly unproductive.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 8:01 PM

Title: Re: Censorship on This Forum

Content:

Rudra said:

Vigorous Dzogchen debate is encouraged and taught in the Bon tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but in IMO debate about Dzogchen is really a waste of time. Debate is just conceptual grasping itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Censorship on This Forum

Content:

Rudra said:

There seems to be a belief that by refining one's intellectual understanding of Dzogchen terminology that one can build a stairway to Rigpa through conceptual grasping.

Malcolm wrote:

No one has this belief. Everyone here understands that the real knowledge of Dzogchen is based on personal experience.

I don't know why you were banned, but it might be because of saying things like "fundamentalist Taliban intellectuals".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Would you say the translation you just posted above is most accurate? (I assume you would be saying that I'm sure you translated it)

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, yes. My translation of the passage is based on Vimalamitra's commentary of the passage in question, which apart from one error pointed out above, is perfectly fine.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

Jnana said:

Yeah. And what's even more hilarious is arguing over poetry!!!

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen texts are not poetry. This is a common misunderstanding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

Adamantine said:

...

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I made a translation error -- this is from an old, unedited translation I have not re-examined. The passage should be read:

"Since neither of those exist [i.e. samsara or nirvana], one understands that the originally pure vidyā [rig pa] which apprehends the basis and the vidyā of insight, the chains, do not exist other than being mere designations...

(My bad I don't usually trot out unedited translations without checking them to see if they are free of errors)

The passage is trying to state that all of these discussions are merely nominal. This is why Longchenpa, Jigme Lingpa and others state over and over the intention of Dzogchen and the intention of Madhyamaka are the same.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

Adamantine said:

I have to admit I am a bit confused too, even considering the context..that is if we are holding it to standards of logic as opposed to a type poetic allusion.

Unless it is trying to say that "existence" only makes sense when contrasted with non-existence.. and since there is nothing apart from pure vidya and vidya of insight therefore there is no "existence" of vidya per se.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 13th, 2012 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

it says "since there is nothing but X1 and X2, X does not exist" how does that make sense semantically?

Malcolm wrote:

You are being myopic:

Here is the passage Vimalamitra is commenting on:

There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not

exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, prajñā does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway.

Context, context, context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Namdrol said:

Vimalamitra's final paragraph on this passage states:

"Since neither of those exist [i.e. samsara or nirvana], since one understands that there nothing apart from the originally pure vidyā [rig pa] which apprehends the basis and the vidyā of insight which apprehends the chains, it [vidyā] also does not exist. Since the essence of vidyā does not exist, the vidyā of the perduring basis (the source of both energy [rtsal] and qualities, and also the apprehender of characteristics) does not exist.

gad rgyangs said:

Hi N - I'm having trouble with this paragraph: the translation appears to be saying " since there (is)* nothing apart from pure vidya and vidya of insight, vidya does not exist." On the face of it, this makes no sense.

*Im assumng this word was left out accidentally?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is a a typo.

And the passage makes perfect sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

samdrup said:

Hey M,

You missed the main event Banned maybe? Don't know.

S.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh? What was the main event?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Neo-Advaita

Content:

Jinzang said:

The real difference between Advaita and Madhyamika is that what Advaita takes to be an inexpressible something Madhyamika explains as the absence of anything determinate.

gad rgyangs said:

comparing advaita and madhyamaka is apples and oranges. comparing advaita and dzogchen or shentong is more interesting. I wonder if Shakya chokden, Mipham, Kongtrul, Kalu Rinpoche or Dudjom Rinpoche came here they would be attacked for being "crypto vedantins" and banned.

Malcolm wrote:

First, Mipham was not a gzhan stong pa, though he was very interested in rennovating Yogacara and reintrepreting (unsuccessfully, IMO) it in a madhyamaka manner.

Dudjom Rinpoche was basically a follower of Kongtrul's modernized gzhan stong which owes more to Shakya Chogchen than Dolbuba.

Even here, the vast majority of modern gzhan stong pas claim that it (gzhan stong) is a post-meditative intepretive scheme not used in meditation. They claim that in meditation there their view is the same as what they describe as rang stong.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 12th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jax said:

You are Being.

Namdrol said:

This is not Dzogchen. This is Neo-Advaita.

Jax said:

Ok... you are not Being? If Dzogchen is a "confirming negation", which it is, then there is affirmative existence regarding Rigpa. This is the difference between Madhyamaka and Dzogchen. Madhyamaka is a "non-confirming negation", leaving us just with emptiness. Hence Madhyamaka is a different result. Vajrasattva means Diamond Being. It is not

about neo-advaita or Taoism... its about what we are. We are Aware Emptiness in full integration with our equally empty, yet appearing Luminosity.

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think Dzogchen is a affirming negation?

This is not the case. Dzogchen does not have a view to support or promulgate, and that is what affirming negations are for i.e. rejecting one thing in order to prove one's own perspective. By asserting that Dzogchen is asserting an affirming negation you are rendering Dzogchen inferior to Madhyamaka.

If Dzogchen is an affirming negation, than this statement from the Unwritten Tantra makes no sense:

“Apparent yet non-existent retinue, listen well! There is no object to distinguish in me, the view of self-originated wisdom; it did not exist before, it will not arise later, and also does not appear in anyway in the present. The path does not exist, action does not exist, traces do not exist, ignorance does not exist, thoughts do not exist, mind does not exist, prajñā does not exist, samsara does not exist, nirvana does not exist, vidyā itself does not even exist, totally not appearing in anyway.”

Vimalamitra's final paragraph on this passage states:

"Since neither of those exist [i.e. samsara or nirvana], since one understands that there nothing apart from the originally pure vidyā [rig pa] which apprehends the basis and the vidyā of insight which apprehends the chains, it [vidyā] also does not exist. Since the essence of vidyā does not exist, the vidyā of the perduring basis (the source of both energy [rtsal] and qualities, and also the apprehender of characteristics) does not exist.

Since the wisdom appearances of people's own vidyā that are seen in personal experience are not established as entities of any kind, it is the appearance of the exhaustion of dharmatā."

Further, Vimalamitra states in The Lamp Summarizing Emptiness:

Now then, the emptiness of dharmatā: natural dharmatā is the emptiness of the non-existence of a primal substance. Thus, all appearances were never established according to the eight examples of illusion. When appearances spread, that basis of the emptiness of dharmatā does not shift whatsoever, never transcending the emptiness of dharmatā. Furthermore:

Everything arose from non-arising;
even arising itself never arose.

Dharmatā in and of itself is empty without a basis, present at all times as the single nature of the great emptiness of the basis, path, and result. Furthermore, primordial emptiness is empty without beginning. [180]

Empty things are empty by nature.

Since the emptiness of dharmatā is present without being contrived and without being transformed in the basis, yogins are also liberated by remaining naturally without

contrivance and without transformations.

And:

"That dharmatā emptiness dwells in a fortress and is captured in a fortress: the fortress (that is like a circle of spears in the sky) encircles (without a beginning or an end) dharmatā, i.e., existence is dharmatā, non-existence is dharmatā, both are dharmatā and neither are dharmatā. As such, [dharmatā] is surrounded by the names “clear and unclear”, “empty and not-empty”, “existence and non-existence”, “permanence and annihilation”, and so on. That lack of finding evidence itself is dharmatā. Further, in reality nothing exists apart from dharmatā. That being the case, that emptiness (as a mere representation, baseless, and non-referential, being non-existent like a pretense) is understood with scripture, accepted by reasoning, proven by argument, and captured in a fortress. Be confident that dharmatā is the unmistakable true emptiness.

Therefore, to describe Dzogchen as an affirming negation does not make any sense at all.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jax said:

You are Being.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not Dzogchen. This is Neo-Advaita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 6:28 PM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

Sönam said:

Is there not a notion of knowledge in being present? ... instant presence is a knowledge, isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 2:31 PM

Title: Re: What is the Point of Tögal?

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

This^ contradicts what the Dzogchen tantras say. the tantras and the commentaries on them give at least 7 ways in which tögal and its realization is superior to trekchod.

Wanna know what they are? Gotta go talk to a Dzogchen master who will explain this at the proper time. Suffice it say that tögal is not some enhancement for trekchod. To the contrary, trekchod enables the knowledge and stability necessary for tögal to work.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no tregchö without tögal, and no tögal without tregchö.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 2:16 PM

Title: Re: Origins of Dzogchen

Content:

Jax said:

Ahem... Guys, I didn't hear one word of refutation regarding Sam Van Schaik's and David Germano's attributions of the origins of Dzogchen. Do you know of more scholarly evidence that points to other origins? Or is this topic taboo to the "true believers" in the mythological stories regarding Dzogchen's origins?

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing to refute. They are text critical historians -- their job is to figure out when a certain idea was first documented on a piece of paper. The inferences they draw from that however should not be regarded as gospels themselves. Western scholarship is all fine and dandy, but it does not lead one to understand what is a valid teaching and what is not.

Dzogchen tantras are intrinsically valid irrespective if they were written in the eighth century, the first aeon, or the twenty first century, they do not need the confirmation of this or that western scholar's opinion. They express the awakened state of persons such as Garab Dorje, Manjushrimitra, Vimalamitra, Rigzin Godem, ChNN, KDL, etc.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 2:05 PM

Title: Re: rigpa != presence ?

Content:

Sönam said:

Not to forget that Namkhai Norbu itself has choose to translate rigpa by "presence".

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN sometimes translates it as instant presence, sometimes as knowledge. In fact, Vimalamitra defines fives kinds of vidyā.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 10th, 2012 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: What is the Point of Togal?

Content:

Jax said:

If you read Longchenpa's Precious Seven Treasuries texts, the Lamas overseeing the translation, Chagdud Rinpoche, Tulku Thondup, Mingyur Rinpoche, Khenpo Tsewang Gyatso, Khenpo Gyurmed Tinley, and Lama Sonam Tsering... ALL chose the word "awareness" to be used for Rigpa whenever cited.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually it was the editorial staff who chose that term. Since I know the senior editor who works on those books quite well, I am quite sure of this.

Jax said:

That is good enough for me. Also Tulku Urgyen often uses the term "awareness" for Rigpa in his dual volume As It Is texts.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that would have been Eric Pema Kunsang. Eric has since decided that "awareness" is not a good equivalent for rigpa.

Jax said:

That would be just translating "vidya" as knowledge from the sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is clearly the intent of the term "rigpa"; hence ChNN over and over again defines rigpa (vidyā) as a species of knowledge about one's state as opposed to avidyā, i.e. not knowing that state.

It is best to leave the term either in Tibetan or in Sanskrit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 9th, 2012 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

when he says "the awareness through which I can say that "I am aware of this sense of self"" this is basically a knowledge of the basis, and therefore, rigpa. (IMO)

Malcolm wrote:

Pity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 9th, 2012 at 6:52 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

padma norbu said:

I see at least 50 people in the retreat photo on his website. At \$70 per person per day

Malcolm wrote:

\$3500 (\$70 x 50 people) per day is a pretty good racket. A labor of love indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 5th, 2012 at 2:29 PM

Title: Re: According to Yogachara...?

Content:

Jinzang said:

Most Nyingma... practitioners hold the view of other emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely a huge over statement.

Some Nyingmapas like gzhan stong, not most.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 2nd, 2012 at 1:34 PM

Title: Re: Possession

Content:

Konchog1 said:

I read in the paper that a woman with two daughters was suffering from burning pain in her stomach and back, headaches, and anxiety. So Valentines Day, she buys her daughters some presents and the next day she drowns them. Everyone that knew her is

stunned by her odd behavior so I was wondering Namdrol, do you think this is a case of possession? By Gyalpo?

Malcolm wrote:

Provocation for sure, not sure what kind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 1st, 2012 at 3:00 PM

Title: Re: Taking vimala and semde concurrently

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol,

Would it be OK to take semde in the a.m. and vimala at bedtime?

I ask because nearly a month of taking vimala every night has resolved my anxiety pretty much entirely, but while it's really taken the edge off my depression, it still lingers on.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Take semde in the am.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 27th, 2012 at 4:30 PM

Title: Re: Arhat From The Perspective Of Mahayana

Content:

Huseng said:

However, some might have suggested that the real cause for rebirth was ignorance with desire being a secondary by-product of that ignorance, in which case the ignorant Arhat, despite having achieved cessation of desire, could still be subject to eventual rebirth regardless.

Malcolm wrote:

But then we have the POV of Vasubandhu that Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas are subject to a non-afflictive ignorance, hence this will not drive rebirth.

Retrogression of Arhats, BTW, just means they return to the state of a never returner, not that they regress to being ordinary beings.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 11:39 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

heart said:
Exactly, I think that is clear from my quote as well.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
yup

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 11:39 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

heart said:
Exactly, I think that is clear from my quote as well.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
yup

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 10:15 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

heart said:
"Likewise, no ignorance exist in the ground, yet ignorance naturally arise from the aspect of what manifested as compassion."

/magnus

gad rgyangs said:
exactly.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since that aspect was not recognized, but compassion does not arise as ignorance otherwise, ignorance would be intrinsic to the ground, and it is not. For example, the five lights do not arise as the five elements, but since the display of the basis was not recognized, the five elements are effectively arise through the non-recognition of the five lights.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings...

Content:

Dronma said:

Do they sound the same?

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Translating the Words of the Buddha

Content:

Karinos said:

I think they do deep revision sutra by sutra (or tantra by tantra) as far as I understood from their page. however you are right about complete revision at the end.

Malcolm wrote:

The thing is for example Conze has become a defacto standard in PP sutra literature. So the translation of Abhisamaalamkara by Spareham largely follows his lead.

So what do we do, retranslate the all these sutras and then make sure that the vast corpus of AA commentary texts use the those sutra passages or what? It is a big question -- that is why my verdict on the thing is only OK.

For example in the tantra they released they translated camphor but did not translate "silha" which is Frankincense and related resins from trees of the Boswellia family. With just a little extra digging they could have sorted that out.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Unknown said:

Namdrol could you please provide some quotes from where you got this? Looking at Tshigdon Mdzod it seems to me that it is saying that ignorance is not part of the appearances of the base. However I can't find anything that says that ignorance is prior to the appearance but more looks like the opposite (or maybe that they arise at the same time?). What is there to be ignorant about before the appearance of the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no avidyā in the basis, but through non-recognition, avidyā depends on vidyā after the appearances of the basis. This is only possible if the awareness and knowing factor which are complete in the basis are not aware of themselves (which they aren't) That lack of knowledge I argue is a species of non-afflictive ignorance.

Samantabhadra upon the arising of the basis possesses the first two kinds of ignorance but never the third (imputing ignorance).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 24th, 2012 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Translating the Words of the Buddha

Content:

Karinos said:

why would you question quality of translation of team of more then 100 people in the first place?

<http://84000.co/about/translators/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<http://84000.co/about/team/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Huseng said:

I can't judge for myself the quality of the translations because I don't know Tibetan. So, I asked Namdrol's opinion as he is a translator of Tibetan with many years experience.

I hope their translations are quality.

Malcolm wrote:

Once the whole thing is translated, a complete revision will be necessary to take into account intertextuality. It is a good first step, but these translations should be regarded as drafts subject to change, as all translation made in the present day should be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Im also not sure which term from the Dzogchen corpus you are translating as "convention"?

Malcolm wrote:

tha snyad, vyavahara.

This is why, as the rigpa rang shar states, though in Dzogchen there is actually no basis, path and result, nevertheless, we talk about a basis, path and result. Ergo, the basis and the rest are merely conventional, quite in line with Haribhadra's proclamation that the entire path, including buddhahood, is totally illusory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Translating the Words of the Buddha

Content:

Pero said:

Which Dzogchen texts are in the Kangyur?

Namdrol said:

kun byed rgyal po

Huseng said:

Can you comment on the quality of the English texts being produced in the 84000 project?

Malcolm wrote:

they are ok.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

The basis is merely a convention.

gad rgyangs said:
in what sense, surely not in a madhyamaka sense.

Malcolm wrote:
There basis is not real. Ergo it is merely a convention. If someone should think the basis was real, they would be missing the point of ka dag. The basis is baseless, it is not established in anyway at all.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 8:59 PM
Title: Re: Translating the Words of the Buddha
Content:
Pero said:
Which Dzogchen texts are in the Kangyur?

Malcolm wrote:
kun byed rgyal po

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, February 23rd, 2012 at 6:32 PM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
The basis is a convention isn't it?

gad rgyangs said:
the word "basis" is a convention, the basis is not.

Malcolm wrote:
The basis is merely a convention.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 11:36 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
Longchenpa was a historical personality whose realization is not disputed, and whose

actual writings we have intact. Garab Dorje, not so much. Texts attributed to GD are pretty much like texts where Samantabhadra or Vajrasattva is speaking (not that that's a problem or anything).

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is the difference between you and I -- I pretty much think that Garab Dorje is a historical personality. We have his extant writings.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Sönam said:

But Dzogchen view is not Dzogchen ... how can a point of view express the Base? Language is his own limitation, sounds can possibly express the Base not concepts?

Sönam

gad rgyangs said:

tell that to Longchenpa, whose mdzod bdun (7 treasures) is devoted to expressing the Dzogchen view in many ways, from technical philosophy to poetry, and runs to ~4300 pages altogether.

Malcolm wrote:

Longchenpa, in most of these works, was attempting to legitimize Dzogchen in the context of scholasticism.

I prefer Garab Dorje.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=6607&p=78514&hilit=Pralaya#p78514>

Lhug-Pa said:

So then gZhi is translated as Laya, Sthana, or could be translated as both?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Pay attention to what I said-- "ignorance is not an appearance of the basis".

gad rgyangs said:

If "All phenomena of samsara and nirvana are appearances of the basis". (premise from innumerable texts)

and "Ignorance is not an appearance of the basis" (Namdrol).

Therefore: ignorance is not a phenomena of samsara or nirvana. (implication of your claim).

Malcolm wrote:

Your major premise and minor premise don't match. Therefore, the conclusion is faulty.

Further, ignorance is prior to the appearance of samsara and nirvana, correct? Since ignorance is prior to the appearance of the basis, consequently, ignorance is not an appearance of the basis.

Ignorance exists before the basis appears; therefore ignorance is not an appearance of the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 20th, 2012 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if Namdrol refuses to acknowledge that "all phenomena of samsara and nirvana" are appearances of the basis

Malcolm wrote:

I did not refuse to acknowledge that. Pay attention to what I said-- "ignorance is not an appearance of the basis".

gad rgyangs said:

and insists that ignorance is instead separately based on a kun gzhi which is not itself an appearance of the basis,

Malcolm wrote:

Kun gzhi is a synonym of ignorance.

But, as I said before, it is not appropriate to argue and debate about Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 19th, 2012 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Astus said:

The concept of equality is another thing, mostly a legal matter and such.

Namdrol said:

That is not how we Americans view the issue.

kirtu said:

My experience with American's and equality is that while Americans verbally venerate equality

Malcolm wrote:

It's a process. Once the concept of rights caught hold, human beings started to catch up with the idea.

The American concept of rights does not immediately mean that everyone sees the full implications the notion of equal rights or that there is no injustice. But rights are considered inalienable, and the process of our Democracy involves discovering those rights as we go along.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 19th, 2012 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

Third, sentient beings are part of the appearance of the basis (since they are comprised of the five elements), their ignorance however is not because ignorance does not and cannot belong to the basis. Their ignorance (avidyā) is precisely their lack of knowledge of the nature of the basis (hence ignorance depends on the basis), just as their knowledge (vidyā) is precisely the knowledge of the nature of the basis.

gad rgyangs said:

sentient beings are part of the appearances of the basis, and a sentient being is a consciousness obscured by non-recognition. "the ground of all that arises", "the ground for all phenomena of samsara and nirvana", how many different ways does it need to be said? If ignorance is not a phenomena of samsara, I don't know what is. "It arises as anything at all" - including ignorance, delusion, and confusion, i.e. us sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis [gzhi] is not the all-basis [kun gzhi], which is that you are describing here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

muni said:

The methods of correcting/comparing/analysing/rejecting/accepting-tradition by intellectual scholars, what is that regarding nature-dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Potentially useless proliferation divorced from practical experience -- but if it helps someone see their way clear to understanding, then fine, if not, well it is waste of time.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

ཐུགས་རྗེ་སྤར་པ་ལས་མ་རིག་བ་བྱུང་

Ignorance was produced from an arising that falsely resembles [i.e. ltar as byed khul, not nang bzhin] compassion.

gad rgyangs said:

what justification is there for reading ltar as byed khul?

In any case, you still have not stated what you consider to be the ground of ignorance. is a sentient being part of the appearances of the basis? if so, so is its ignorance. if not, then what is a sentient being in relation to the appearances of the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

As for your first question, it is based on the context of the sentence as well as its grammar.

As for your second question I have explained this, so I am not going to explain it again.

Third, sentient beings are part of the appearance of the basis (since they are comprised of the five elements), their ignorance however is not because ignorance does not and cannot belong to the basis. Their ignorance (avidyā) is precisely their lack of knowledge of the nature of the basis (hence ignorance depends on the basis), just as their knowledge (vidyā) is precisely the knowledge of the nature of the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:39 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

are you still maintaing this, and if so, how do you explain it within the context of the quote?

Malcolm wrote:

That does not say that non-recognition is an appearance of the basis i.e.

གཞི་ལ་མ་རིག་པ་ཡོད་པ་ཅང་མ་ཡིན་

Ignorance never [cang ma yin] existed in the basis.

It says:

ཐུགས་རྗེ་མ་ངེས་པ་ལས་མ་རིག་པ་རང་བྱུང་

Ignorance self-originated from the non-ascertainment of compassion.

And:

ཐུགས་རྗེ་ལྟར་ཤར་བ་ལས་མ་རིག་པ་བྱུང་

Ignorance was produced from an arising that falsely resembles [i.e. ltar as byed khul, not nang bzhin] compassion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:17 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Longchenpa in the tshig don mdzod quotes the Auspicious Beauty Tantra (bkra shis mdzes ldan):

Malcolm wrote:

So what's the problem? this is perfectly clear. You answered your own question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 10:21 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Caz said:

There is no such thing as equality in Samsara and as far as I know Buddhists are still within Samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that is exactly one kind of equality i.e. being in samsara all sentient beings are equal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Astus said:

Equality requires a mind that sees all as equals.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it doesn't.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

kirtu said:

Methinks this is not an auspicious beginning

Malcolm wrote:

A reformation of Buddhism is inevitable in its coming to the west, just as the Protestant Reformation was inevitable in Northern Europe.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism / Nonduality Influenced Metal Bands

Content:

padma norbu said:

David Tibet, too. That's not his real last name and he may be influenced by Tibetan Buddhism, but he's more of a Crowley/Spare kinda guy. He fronts Current 93

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, yes, yes, and yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Astus said:

"Therefore a bhikkhu ... should not present himself as equal to, nor imagine himself to be inferior, nor better than, another."

(<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.4.05.irel.html>)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and I wish more bhikkhus would recall this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Astus said:

The concept of equality is another thing, mostly a legal matter and such.

Malcolm wrote:
That is not how we Americans view the issue.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, February 18th, 2012 at 12:17 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
and the basis of that non-recognition is marigpa and the basis of marigpa is...?

Malcolm wrote:
Ignorance has three causes, essence, nature and compassion. However, as Padmasambhava states in the Khandro Nyingthig (volume I, pg 348)

"Therefore, in that case, the three causes of ignorance are the trio of essence, nature and compassion...Further more, though those three wisdoms above cannot cause delusion, there is the delusion of the condition of ignorance about them. For example, though within the sun there is no basis nor cause for darkness, it is like being blocked by fog in the sky."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 11:21 PM
Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?
Content:
Huseng said:
This is one thing that might get dropped if Buddhism is really transmitted into the west.

Namdrol said:
And good riddance too.

N

Huseng said:
I've come to have similar sentiments.

But then here in Asia, from India to Nepal to Taiwan, the whole hierarchy thing is ever present. This kind of thing is part of institutionalized Buddhism everywhere in Asia of course, though trying to extract Buddhadharma from it while maintaining the lifeline of a tradition for more than a generation might prove difficult.

I think some monastics might try to justify it by saying it fosters humility or something, but that to me is just contrived and superficial head bowing. Another form of self-grasping and cause for worry about offending someone.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the problem is that Asians tend to identify their hierarchy _as_ the Dharma. This is one reason I personally find the explicit leveling of hierarchy in Dzogchen so appealing, and why traditionally in Tibet, at any rate, Dzogchen teachings were considered threatening to the hierarchy. If you tell a bunch of folks that ignorant butchers will achieve realization faster than panditas based on instructions that you possess, it is going to shake some things up.

And yes, BTW to your question, the way it stands now is that some Buddhists are more equal than others -- for example, monastics with jobs still get to attend many teachings free of charge, while unemployed lay people are barred entrance. There is a phenomena in Buddhism where monastics correct every threat to their hegemony. This is largely sociological -- in societies where power lay in the hands of the aristocracy, the only way to power for common people is through the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

In societies like ours, where there is no de facto aristocracy, monastic heirarchies become one. In Buddhism in particular there is this notion of a hierarchy of virtue. I do not believe this was the Buddha's intent, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Huseng said:

This is one thing that might get dropped if Buddhism is really transmitted into the west.

Malcolm wrote:

And good riddance too.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Are some Buddhists more equal than others?

Content:

Huseng said:

In many modern day societies there is at the least the pretence and belief that everyone is equal no matter their status or background.

I think this belief might get transferred over to contemporary Buddhist communities as well to some extent. It wouldn't please people to just outright say that the male monks are chiefly superior followed by the male novices, then female nuns, female novices and following them the laity, even though this is how it is presented on paper. Seating arrangements have always been quite important. Moreover, there is a prescribed

hierarchy.

So do we run into a situation where everyone is equal, but some are more equal than others? Wouldn't it just be best to do away with such pretences and consent to the existence of a prescribed hierarchy where male monastics are at the top and laity at the bottom? Or should a monastic have to earn their position of respect from the laity by virtue of wisdom and deeds rather than by putting on robes and formally renouncing?

Malcolm wrote:

Of what use is this proliferation about rank and position?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings...

Content:

catmoon said:

Did you mean to say "cause" instead of consequence?

The idea that Dharma is the cause and Dzogchen the result can't possibly be universal, simply because there are billions of Buddhists who are not Dzogchenpas.

Malcolm wrote:

All Buddhas are Dzogchenpas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Namdrol said:

I am not claiming that non-recognition is an appearance of the basis. I never said that, or even implied it. That is your imputation.

gad rgyangs said:

what is there besides the basis and appearances of the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

The non-recognition of that appearance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

conebeckham said:

You assume the lack of the false imagination, and specifically the lack of duality, in the

dependent is the only thing that parinispanna signifies? That the perfect nature is merely the lack of false imagination?

This would seem to imply that the seeds, or some sort of "contents" of the alaya, would still be present....or do you find all the seeds, habits, etc., would be purified merely by virtue of the lack of false imagination?

Malcolm wrote:

Recognizing the non-existence of the unreal is parinispanna, that is the classical Yogacara presentation of emptiness free from extremes.

How the paths and stages are meditated is a different story. I don't think we can say it is sufficient to merely recognize this fact and then we are finished. This is how the Yogacara scholars are presenting the view of emptiness, which is why for example, the Madhyāntavibhaga gives a presentation of the sixteen emptinesses. If this recognition were sufficient, there would be no purpose for the rest of the treatises which details the 37 bodhipakṣa dharmas and so on.

Anyway, in 1:3-4, Vasubandhu explains MV as follows:

As such, having described the characteristic of the existence and and characteristics of the non-existence of the imagination of the false, now the intrinsic characteristic will be described:

Consciousness appearing
as objects, sentient beings, self, and cognitions
arise, but its objects do not exist,
since they do not exist, it does not exist.

Now then, appearing as objects means whatever appears as a thing such as form and so on; appearing as sentient beings what appears to the five sense organs appearing in the continuums of self and others; appearing as a self is the afflicted mind because the concomitance of confusion and so about a self; appearing as a cognition is the six consciousnesses. "Its objects do not exist means" the appearances as objects, and sentient beings do exist; self and cognitions means mistaken appearances. Since the objects do not exist, also that apprehending consciousness does not exist.

That imagination of the unreal
is established because of that,
is not as it seems, is not a total non-existent.

As such, however appearances are produced, they are not as they seem; because of the production of mere delusion, are also not totally non-existent.

If it is asked why its total non-existence is not asserted:

Having exhausted that, liberation is asserted.

If it were otherwise, bondage and freedom would not be established, and definitely the afflictive state and complete purification would be repudiated.

There are three points here:

- 1) The imagination is the dependent.
- 2) It is held to exist, but its content does not exist.
- 3) If it is held to be totally non-existent, both samsara and nirvana are impossible because there would be no basis for delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Jikan said:

Seems to me that Wonhyo advocated a ninth consciousness on the basis of the Vajrasamadhi sutra (published as Cultivating Original Enlightenment). I know that Wonhyo himself was likely the compiler of that text. I bring it up because I'd like to know if this concept took hold in Korean Buddhism following Wonhyo, or if it was forgotten.

Malcolm wrote:

This sutra is well established to be a Korean composition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if (as you are claiming) appearances of the basis are the basis, and non-recognition is an appearance of the basis, then non-recognition is the basis. this makes no sense, therefore, appearances of the basis are not the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not claiming that non-recognition is an appearance of the basis. I never said that, or even implied it. That is your imputation.

Anyway, Dzogchen is not something to be debated or argued. Learn Tibetan.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

I see. So this was completely of his own invention then?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thats not the basis appearing, otherwise there would be no reason to distinguish basis (gzhi) from appearances of the basis (gzhi snang) and have two terms.

Namdrol said:

And you think this because?

gad rgyangs said:

since the basis is also the basis for non-recognition, it would mean that marigpa would be a characteristic of the basis.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is the basis for non-recognition. This is why for example, the Rosary of Pearls states:

Though the explanation of the basis of delusion is of many kinds
it is natural formation and compassion.

There are three wisdoms of the basis, essence, nature and compassion. The appearance of the basis is the nature and compassion aspect. The "invisible" part of the basis is original purity; but essence, nature and compassion are inseparable. This is why the sgra thal rgyu states:

Other than wisdom dwelling in itself,
there is no separation into three modes.

When the basis appears, it was not recognized. That non-recognition however is not a characteristic of the basis because the basis cannot be affected by non-recognition; for example, if one does not recognize someone's face in the crowd, it does not follow necessarily that one's own non-recognition is inherent in the face of the person one should recognize. If it were, that person could never be recognized.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:25 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

[quote="Namdrol"]It seems to be his original contribution. The idea is rejected by Bhavaviveka.

Malcolm wrote:

Was {aramarthas source ffrom any of the sutras?[/quote]

No, this is the reason it was rejected by Bhavaviveka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

nirmal said:

The ninth consciousness, emphasized in Tantra, contains all the virtues and potentialities of Buddhahood. When one is Fully Enlightened, this consciousness becomes the totality of wisdom WITHOUT ANY SENSE OF CONSCIOUSNESS.
)

Malcolm wrote:

There is no Buddhist tantra which teaches a "ninth" consciousness. It does not exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: Random question on Chogyam Trungpa

Content:

Nangwa said:

Great username by the way.

Lotus_Bitch said:

Thank you. I came up with it based off a day dream I had at work, about starting a progressive death metal band with female vocals. The songs subject matter would've been based off of the buddhadharma; hence "Lotus"...With the inclusion of female vocals making it "Bitch." This may or may not be offensive to women.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess it is a rather literal translation of Padmadas, "Servant of Padmasambhava".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

Does anyone know who or what sect has taught or teaches about the amala-vijnana ("stainless" consciousness?)

As far as I know there was only one individual who taught this; an Indian by the name of Paramartha (499-569.) Also apparently the Nichiren sect teaches this, according to this website I found while doing an internet search of the subject:

<https://www.sgi.org/buddhism/buddhist-concepts/the-nine-consciousnesses.html> Is that a legitimate source for what the Nichiren sect teaches? Because I thought it was based off the Lotus sutra and from reading the Lotus sutra: I didn't see any mention of an amala-vijnana?

Namdrol said:

This is a teaching by the Indian scholar Paramartha who introduced this idea to China. It was never a main stream Indian idea.

Lotus_Bitch said:

Where was the source of this theory? As in where did he learn of this? Or was it something he came up with by himself?

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to be his original contribution. The idea is rejected by Bhavaviveka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 6:26 AM

Title: Re: Ninth-Consciousness: Who Teaches This?

Content:

Lotus_Bitch said:

Does anyone know who or what sect has taught or teaches about the amala-vijnana ("stainless" consciousness?)

As far as I know there was only one individual who taught this; an Indian by the name of Paramartha (499-569.) Also apparently the Nichiren sect teaches this, according to this website I found while doing an internet search of the subject:

<https://www.sgi.org/buddhism/buddhist-concepts/the-nine-consciousnesses.html> Is that a legitimate source for what the Nichiren sect teaches? Because I thought it was based off the Lotus sutra and from reading the Lotus sutra: I didn't see any mention of an amala-vijnana?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a teaching by the Indian scholar Paramartha who introduced this idea to China. It was never a main stream Indian idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: gzhan stong and Great Madhyamaka

Content:

conebeckham said:

My personal understanding, at this point, subject to change, is that:

1. Yogacara texts do, in fact, assert an "existent."
2. The nature of that "existent" is the Perfect Nature.
3. The existent which is of the perfect nature is the substrate of all consciousnesses, including the ālayavijñāna, as well as all the other consciousnesses.
4. The ālayavijñāna is not the ultimate existent, as it is said to "cease." In the same way, all the other consciousness cease, so none of them can be said to be ultimate, though they are "of" the ultimate, in a sense.

Malcolm wrote:

The ālayavijñāna is the imagination of the unreal.

So we will break it down: the imagination [dependent nature] of the unreal [the imagined nature] exists; however in it duality does not exist [parinispanna].

So when the unreal is removed, what remains is the dependent nature. That is why it is said that the absence of the imagined in the dependent is the perfected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

since the basis does not appear, how can it be illusory?

Namdrol said:

The basis does appear. This is why we use the term "gzhi snang".

gad rgyangs said:

thats not the basis appearing, otherwise there would be no reason to distinguish basis (gzhi) from appearances of the basis (gzhi snang) and have two terms.

Malcolm wrote:
And you think this because?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 4:09 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
gad rgyangs said:
since the basis does not appear, how can it be illusory?

Malcolm wrote:
The basis does appear. This is why we use the term "gzhi snang".

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 1:25 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:
Namdrol said:
The point of view of Dzogchen, according to Rongzompa, is that all phenomena of samsara and nirvana are completely and totally equivalent with illusions.

gad rgyangs said:
sure but the basis is prior to all phenomena of samsara and nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:
Does not make it any less illusory, does it?

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 1:07 AM
Title: Re: Ground of Being
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
"emptiness" cannot be a substance-noun, it means "the condition of being empty" (OED), agreed? "empty" is an adjective, as in "the glass is empty". you can nominalize this by speaking of "the emptiness of the glass", but this is referring to the fact that the glass is empty, it is not talking about some thing called "emptiness". now, we know that the basis is not some "thing" but rather pure potentiality, "es gibt Sein". Since only conventionalities can be "empty" (since only conventionalities are dependently arisen), and the basis clearly cannot be considered a conventional existent/dependent arising,

then what sense does it make to call it "empty" , let alone calling it "emptiness(!)" surely you're not saying that the basis is simply the fact of the lack of svabhava in dependent arisings? now, if you want to posit another definition of "emptiness", fine, but then don't say that Dzoghchen follows prasangika madhyamaka. if you want, you can say it follows "great madhyamaka", as presented by Dudjom R in the Big Red Book.

Namdrol said:

The basis is a convention.

gad rgyangs said:

you mean like saṃvṛiti/kun rdzob?

Malcolm wrote:

In the Great Perfection, Atiyoga,
there is no basis, path and result,
nevertheless a basis, path and result is taught.

-- Rig pa rang shar

The point of view of Dzoghchen, according to Rongzompa, is that all phenomena of samsara and nirvana are completely and totally equivalent with illusions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 17th, 2012 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"emptiness" cannot be a substance-noun, it means "the condition of being empty" (OED), agreed? "empty" is an adjective, as in "the glass is empty". you can nominalize this by speaking of "the emptiness of the glass", but this is referring to the fact that the glass is empty, it is not talking about some thing called "emptiness". now, we know that the basis is not some "thing" but rather pure potentiality, "es gibt Sein". Since only conventionalities can be "empty" (since only conventionalities are dependently arisen), and the basis clearly cannot be considered a conventional existent/dependent arising, then what sense does it make to call it "empty" , let alone calling it "emptiness(!)" surely you're not saying that the basis is simply the fact of the lack of svabhava in dependent arisings? now, if you want to posit another definition of "emptiness", fine, but then don't say that Dzoghchen follows prasangika madhyamaka. if you want, you can say it follows "great madhyamaka", as presented by Dudjom R in the Big Red Book.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is a convention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if you say that the basis is emptiness, you are reifying emptiness and Nagarjuna has pronounced you incurable.

Malcolm wrote:

For those whom emptiness is possible, for them, everything is possible.

For those whom emptiness is not possible, for them, nothing is possible.

--Nāgarjuna

The basis is emptiness aka original purity.

But I would rather be an incurable Dzogchenpa crossing space in a single movement than a myopic follower of some imagined "madhyamaka" that consists of drearily hopping along on one leg, wondering where the other leg had got to.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Excuse me, it was not mine:

"

Malcolm wrote:

You are missing the point. The point is that you took fragments of passages from different pages in this book, Middle Beyond Extremes, mixed your own words into them, and did not clearly differentiate any of them. Further, your attempt at citation does not form an argument.

Finally, citing what two nineteenth century Tibetan authors write about a 5th century Indian text gives us no insight at all into what the 5th century Indians might have intended in their own words. This thread is not about what Mipham, Dolbupa, Shenga, Tsongkhapa, Gorampa, Mikyo Dorje, Rangjung Dorje, etc. thought about the issues of the relationship between ālayavijñāna and the dependent nature, it is about what Maitryanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu and their Indian followers thought. Karl's B's essay I pointed you too does an excellent job of clarifying that in fact the early Yogacaras authors all use the type 1 model of the three natures, the very one gshan stong pas aka (neo) "Yogacara Madhyamakas" term the cittamatra presentation, which Karl B readily admits. This is indisputable. Of course, KB's paper intends to find sources

for the gzhan stong view in Early Indian Yogacara, but he fails because it is not there.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Also I'm collecting the arguments that show all Buddhism is cohesive and non contradictory in the principle, whatever if sutra or tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so there is no contradiction between positing partless ultimate atoms and emptiness. Sure.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche Fanboys

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

both balls and ovaries"?

Malcolm wrote:

Balls and tits, please.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

That's just how my mind works. For me, the simplest way to sum up why there are no beginnings to anything is to rid myself of the notion of there even being things in an ultimate sense.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a totally unnecessary step. The simplest approach is to recognize that conditioned causes are results and must always themselves have causes. You don't even have to mention emptiness, being, etc. at all. Right?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Each and every phenomenon one could ever think of is dependently originated--we impute singular "thingness" onto "things" which are really aggregations of multiple parts and causes and conditions, and each of those parts are likewise aggregations of multiple parts and causes and conditions, ad infinitum... No thing can be found anywhere that exists by the power of its own essence, made up only of itself, with no dependence on anything else. That being the case--that is, since all phenomena depend for their conventional "existence" on our imputing "thingness" and existence onto them--where can one find anything at all to have begin to exist, endured for a time, and then disintegrated?

At the same time, despite this emptiness, where can one find any cause at all that fails to bear a result, and who can be found that doesn't experience samsara as the Buddha said we do?

PadmaVonSamba said:

Well said!

Thats why cause ->"thingness" isn't a valid understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know why a simple question like this has to be ramped up to the ultimate right away.

There is no ultimate origin for conditioned phenomena. There are no beginnings for conditioned phenomena in general. Right? So bringing complicated discussions about imputations, and emptiness, and so on and so forth don't really answer the question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 7:41 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Further, your habit of mishmashing citations from books is also not very skillful. The fact is that here you have randomly strung together passages from different pages. How can anyone take this as "scholarship"? Why should anyone bother with this type of disorganized presentation?

Mariusz said:

When the false imagination... from Maitreya, Khenpo Shenga and Ju Mipham.

Malcolm wrote:

In short, this is neither from Maitreyanatha, not Mipham, nor Shenga, because you have just randomly strung together bits and peices of texts written and translated by others and added here and there your own words without clearly distinguishing what is what.

Really, get it together, otherwise I am just not going to bother responding to anything you have to say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

also an advise no to make the fault of denigrating conventions for Namdrol.

Malcolm wrote:

I really wish you would stop making baseless personal criticisms that have no part in the conversation.

I really cannot see anywhere in this thread where I have even discussed conventions, let alone denigrated them.

This kind of random, off topic remark ruins conversations. Please desist and confine yourself to the topic at hand.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

You are wrong because you: (2. With respect to the dependent nature, it is empty in the sense that this lack of entity is itself a non-entity, but) for you while nothing exists as imagined, it is the case that wakefulness does not exist.

Malcolm wrote:

Your response is a complete and total non-sequitar. In other words, it does not make any sense.

Also this thread is going wildly off topic due in part to the inability of all respondents to

communicate with sufficient discipline.

Therefore, unless it returns to a proper course, I am finished with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

I've been under the impression that Yogacara is basically a term that can refer to either Asanga's Cittamatra or Vasubandhu's Vijnanavada.

In other words, that Chittamatra and Vijnana-vada are distinct, yet are also both considered Yogachara.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, cittamatra is a term used interchangeably with vijñānamatratvada by Mādhyamika authors. The yogacarins referred to themselves as "yogacarins".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

And it works compatible with my dzogchen

Namdrol said:

When it comes to Vajrayāna, one's intellectual contrived view is pretty irrelevant.

One's view is delivered through the third and fourth empowerments, and or direct introduction, and is maintained on the basis of that experience in one's practice. So all of this is really just dancing on books. (yawn).

Mariusz said:

Even writing it you unintentionally agree with me: "it" has to be pointed-out only. So the principle is the same even considering Vajrayāna/Dzogchen, let alone Yogacara or Madhyamaka. The difference is only the method.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so fast, sport: there is no "pointing-out" in Madhyamaka. From a Madhyamaka perspective, there is no "pointing-out" since there is nothing to be pointed out. The view in Madhyamaka is strictly a result of intellectual analysis, which one then applies in meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche Fanboys

Content:

tomamundsen said:

The Crystal and the Way of Light is profound as balls.

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, February 16th, 2012 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I'm in agreement that this is all dancing on books--this being the Academic Discussion forum, of course that's what's done here. But I feel the need to point out that Yogacara was not merely a conceptual philosophy foisted upon us, but was an attempt to make sense of some real meditative experience, originally--or so I think. Also, all these categorizations into 6, 8, 9 or however-many consciousnesses need to be seen as dynamic attempts at explaining experience in a conceptual way, rather than as "positions" one must defend. Then again, maybe this is all inappropriate for the Academic Discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is true, it was an attempt to explain the stages of the path. It's complexity has resulted in a lot of difficult discussions over the centuries, especially since for the most part the followers of Asanaga and so on were eclipsed by the more practical Mādhyamikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

mint said:

Infinite regression? or beyond infinite regression? (Infinity can seem awfully constraining.)

Malcolm wrote:
Infinite regression.

There are no beginnings.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:44 AM
Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?
Content:
Mariusz said:
And it works compatible with my dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:
When it comes to Vajrayāna, one's intellectual contrived view is pretty irrelevant.

One's view is delivered through the third and fourth empowerments, and or direct introduction, and is maintained on the basis of that experience in one's practice. So all of this is really just dancing on books. (yawn).

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:21 AM
Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?
Content:

Mariusz said:
Of course here I not consider it as the shentong also. Following Nitārtha Institute I consider it as yogacara not as cittamatra's the narrow interpretation.

Namdrol said:
Only gzhan stong pas maintain there is a difference between Yogacara and cittamatra.

N

Mariusz said:
Namdrol, with all respect you are not the only one who want to back into the source, a "archaeologist" for Madhyamaka. Karl Brunnhölzl in "The Center" discovered for example:

Malcolm wrote:
You should read his article at the Tsadra foundation blog where he substantially revises his position about this.

BTW, I remain committed to my statment. Only gzhan stong adherents maintain there is a distinction between a so called "Yogacara" and what Madhyamakas call "cittamatra"; what they like to term "Great Madhyamaka". This is a simple fact of the intellectual history of Tibetan Buddhism.

If you maintain there is such a distinction, you are a gzhan stong adherent.

Otherwise, please explain to us the difference between this so called "Yogacara" and gzhan stong. But please start another thread to do so. Thanks.

By the way, there is no shame in being a gzhan stong pa -- I simply don't agree that the gzhan stong interpretation of Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu's texts is the correct one. I think that Tsongkhapa's refutation of gzhan stong, as well as Rongston and Gorampa's, is apt and accurate. I think Rendawa's is a little too strongly worded.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

So as I understand, it is still the middle way, the poining-out the freedom beyond the reference points.

Malcolm wrote:

Both Madhyakamaka and Cittamatra/Yogacara agree that wisdom is free from proliferation (nisprapañca) and free from reference points (anupalambha).

The difference between them is whether this wisdom is held to be ultimately real or not. This the main reason why Candarkirti goes to such great lengths to refute the Yogacara presentation of paratantra very pointedly at 6:72 in Madhyamakāvatara

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 16th, 2012 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Of course here I not consider it as the shentong also. Following Nitārtha Institute I consider it as yogacara not as cittamatra's the narrow interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Only gzhan stong pas maintain there is a difference between Yogacara and cittamatra.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

So, how can a cause pre-exist everything?

Malcolm wrote:

There was no beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When ever I present some text without attributing the authorship of the translation, you may immediately assume the translation is mine.

Mariusz said:

Now from the translation of Khenpo Shenga:

Malcolm wrote:

I assume by "translation" you mean the presentation of Khenpo Shenga's interlinear commentary as translated in the Middle Beyond Extremes (Snow Lion 2006)? Khenpo Shenga himself never translated anything.

The final line of Khenpo Shenga's commentary (which you seem to find at odds with Vasubandhu's statement I cited above) actually says:

ཐམས་ཅད་གཅིག་ཏུ་སྟོང་པ་ཡང་མ་ཡིན་ལ་གཅིག་ཏུ་མི་སྟོང་པ་ཡང་མ་ཡིན་པ་དེ་ནི་དབུ་མའི་ལམ་ཡིན་ནོ།

Though everything is not empty on the one hand, it is also not not empty on other hand. That is the middle way.

While someone might be tempted to see a difference in meaning between Khenpo Shenga's passage and Vasubandhu's original commentary based on the way the Dharmacakra translation committee has chosen to translate this passage, in reality, based on the way Khenpo Shenga wrote the original Tibetan there is no difference in

meaning.

I think I should add that Khenpo Shenga was in no way a supporter of gzhan stong and was a staunch supporter of Gorampa. Therefore, he, like Gorampa before him, would have and did consider the Madhyāntavibhāga, the Dharmadharmatāvibhāga and the Mahāyānasutrālaṅkāra cittamātrīn texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Seem to me that this thread has lost its focus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

It is an incorrect starting point because in this assumption, "everything" is regarded as some kind of result.

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is some kind of result.

All causes are results, all results can be causes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The question ought to be: is the dependent nature ultimate or not in yogacara texts. I think that actually the answer is yes.

N

Mariusz said:

I think that actually the answer is no.

Malcolm wrote:

The answer is yes:

From the Madhyāntavibhagatīka:

As it is said:

"The imagination of the unreal exists,
duality does not exist in that,
emptiness exists in this,
that also exists in that.

Now then, the imagination of the false means the concept of an apprehended object and the apprehending subject. Duality means free from a real apprehended object and an apprehending subject. Emptiness means the imagination of the false being free from a real apprehended object and an apprehending subject. "That also exists in that" means the imagination of the false. As such, that non-existence of something somewhere, that is truly seeing the empty truly just as it is. Whatever remains here, that is understood just as it truly is to exist here. As such, the characteristic of emptiness is demonstrated without mistake.

Not empty and not not empty,
in that way is everything explained,
because of existence, because of non-existence, because of existence,
that is the middle path.

"It is not empty" means emptiness and the imagination of the false. "It is not not-empty" means duality i.e. the apprehended object and an apprehending subject. 'Everything' means 'the imagination of the false' is the conditioned and 'emptiness' is the unconditioned. 'Explained' means demonstrated. 'Exists' means the imagination of the false. 'Non-existence' means duality. 'Existence' means emptiness exists in the imagination of the false, and the imagination of the false exists in that too. "That is the middle path" means everything is not only empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 12:01 PM

Title: Re: Candrakīrti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

I personally find it bizarre that no-one has translated Prasannapada or the Avataraḥśya or the Catuḥśatīkā. I suppose patience is the order of the day.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree and it is my personal bitch with Buddhist studies of Madhyamaka, as you know. There is no base line by which we can judge what all these Tibetans are gossiping about in their treatises unless one reads Tibetan and Sanskrit.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 11:57 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

Huifeng said:

Any sort of academic discussion on the topic of "ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?" would have to be text, or text statement, specific.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Well then make one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: ālayavijñāna--conventional or ultimate existent?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Reposted, after some editing, as off-topic on the Chandakirit/Alaya thread.

The question is, whether ālayavijñāna is posited to be truly existent, or merely conventionally existent, in Yogacara texts...

Malcolm wrote:

The question ought to be: is the dependent nature ultimate or not in yogacara texts. I think that actually the answer is yes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 8:25 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

conebeckham said:

Cloudburst-

Doesn't it make more sense to "birth" a storehouse consciousness, inherent or not, due to things such as "memories," "habits," etc., than to create the notion of ālayavijñāna as that which is merely the "mental consciousness knowing emptiness?"

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Cone:

The ālaya is emptiness, that is all that is needed for karma to function. No

consciousness that stores seeds is required. But consciousness can know that emptiness, this is how Jayananda is glossing things because of the Lanka passage which describes the ālayavijñāna as subtle and deep, and easily mistaken for a self and also the Lanka passage to declares ālayavijñāna is emptiness.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 8:21 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

Is it your point of view that Buddha did teach the alaya, but that he meant the mental consciousness knowing emptiness? This was misunderstood by yogacharins and the idea of an inherent storehouse consciousness was "born."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, technically the Yogacarins don't really treat the ālayavijñāna as "inherent", since if you read the Mahāyānasamgraha, Asanga clearly maintains that when the seeds are exhausted, the ālayavijñāna ceases to exist. So then the question becomes not so much about the this consciousness, the ālayavijñāna, but paratantra, dependent nature.

These interpretative difficulties are addressed somewhat by Candrakirti in the verses that cover the dependent nature, 47-72.

As to your first question -- definitely this is Jayananda's interpretation. Given the way Candrakirti cites the Lanka to this effect, it is probable that this is Candra's point of view as well, though I would not swear to it. Given that the Buddha of the Lanka also treats the Ālaya as an interpretable doctrine, the Buddha (as presented in this sutra) seems to have presented ālayavijñāna to just a consciousness that apprehends emptiness, but it is not so clearly stated. All the Buddha really says there is that "know that only emptiness is indicated by the [the term] ālayavijñāna".

To really get at the guts of what Candra thinks about this one would need to read the lengthy discussions of both commentaries covering the ground between 47-72.

I am sorry but I will have to spend some serious amount of time with these things before I really can respond any further. But I will. Jayananda has an exhaustive presentation of his perspective on Yogacara that fills his commentary.

Candra sticks more to the his own text.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

Namdrol said:

Tibetan madhyamaka/yogacara is more safe than alone translations.

Malcolm wrote:

Both have their hazards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: Guidance on renunciation

Content:

Nemo said:

Afterwards your job prospects will be shite. You won't even know about movies or sports people are talking about. You will be very soft and not well suited for the competitive world that we struggle in. Your guilelessness will get you into all sorts of trouble. After you may shack up with inappropriate women...

Malcolm wrote:

Glad I am not alone in this experience.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Ground of Being

Content:

mint said:

If everything has a cause, who/what caused the ground of being (Base)?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis has no cause because it is just emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

conebeckham said:

I don't see how this quote posits an existent Alaya--it posits an existent "luminous mind of dharmata," for sure....but this is not the ālayavijñāna.

Malcolm wrote:

You are totally off-topic. But this is just like saying dirty/clean cloth. The question is where the cloth is real, not whether it is dirty or clean, it's state of being clean or dirty is incidental; the question of its conventional or ultimate existence is not.

BTW. I can only handle so many threads at a time. Looking up answers takes time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

Namdrol said:

What Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu claim is that the dependent nature is real, it exists. However, the dependent nature = the ālayavijñāna. The ālaya is only called the ālaya as long as there are seeds. When these have been eradicated, the ālaya also ceases; but the dependent nature, being an existent, does not.

Mariusz said:

Can I ask two implications please? I cannot find more.

Is it means the dependent nature (gzhan dbang; paratantra) has no seeds at all during its "existence" with or without the ālayavijñāna? Or is it means the dependent nature (gzhan dbang; paratantra) has seeds somehow more subtle than the ālayavijñāna which are still "existent" even after the eradication of the ālayavijñāna?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that while the ālayavijñāna depends on seeds for the name "ālaya", the dependent nature does not depend on seeds for the name "dependent nature". But please, if you want to talk yogacara, start another thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

I am sure you have your reasons as to why you refuse to answer this question post after post. So that we can know that you are not answering just to avoid having to admit that he did teach that, would you kindly answer?

According to you, did Buddha ever teach that there were 8 consciousnesses?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not answer directly because I already mentioned that fact that while

svāsaṃvedana is not mentioned in the sutras, ālayavijñāna was. Since I stated that ālayavijñāna was mentioned as something taught by the Buddha, by implication we can understand the other seven were also taught since ālayavijñāna is never taught in absence of the other seven, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

Is it your claim that Buddha never taught that inherent persons exist?

Malcolm wrote:

There are some who thought the Buddha taught such a thing aka the Pudgalavadins. I myself have never seen a sutra statement, for example, in the Pali canon, where the Buddha unambiguously claims there is an ultimate self of the kind proposed by Pudgalavadins.

Namdrol said:

The Buddha never explained anywhere that the self and the aggregates existed ultimately -- who told you he did?

Mipham (I know, you don't care about Tibetans and their points of view.)

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps you can send me a citation by PM where he says such a thing. To me it seems a little strange and not in accordance with what I have understood about the Buddha's teaching in the Pali canon, etc.

Namdrol said:

Vasubandhu devotes an entire chapter in the Kosha refuting the person, his main Buddhist target being the Pudgalavadins.

This does not indicate that Buddha never taught it, though.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Vasubandhu shows how the key citations Pudgalavadins use to support their view is misunderstood by them. I suggest you read the Kosha, Chapter nine. If you think the Buddha taught such an ultimate self, or the aggregate(!?) as ultimate, please tell me where.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

conebeckham said:

I don't think Vasubhandu claimed the Alaya, per se, "existed" as an absolute

Malcolm wrote:

What Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu claim is that the dependent nature is real, it exists. However, the dependent nature = the ālayavijñāna. The ālaya is only called the ālaya as long as there are seeds. When these have been eradicated, the ālaya also ceases; but the dependent nature, being an existent, does not.

Just to recap -- the classical Yogacara(Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu) model holds that parikalpita is non-existent, but paratantra and parinispāna do exist. The late Indian/gzhan stong interpretation is that parikalpita is non-existent, paratantra is merely conventionally existent, and parinispāna exists, mapping the three natures respectively onto false relative truth, true relative truth and ultimate truth.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Huseng said:

Just the finer details of precisely how it was described and taught we are unsure of.

Malcolm wrote:

This is unimportant for the present conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Huseng said:

I'm just specifying that due to the differing accounts we can't be so sure about what the Buddha taught.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I simply do not agree with this perspective. I think we can be very, very, very sure.

Btw, yoru statement above really harms claims you made earlier in this thread citing scriptural authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Huseng said:

Well, the Vinaya does record what the Buddha said and provides his judgement on various matters. Don't you think that is important?

Malcolm wrote:

The Vinayas record what the Buddha said to different groups of monks in different parts of India. But also, they report differing accounts since these Sanghas were widespread.

Huseng said:

I agree that we have the general teachings and there is no doubt of that (especially in the case of rebirth, karma, dependent origination, etc...), but the finer details vary too much for us to say for sure exactly what was taught.

Malcolm wrote:

General principles are the point in this discussion, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Our record of what the historical Buddha taught is therefore much better than what skeptics would have us believe. And as well, the content of the Pali canon is so homogenous, really, there is no doubt what the Buddha taught. And it was not what Batchelor is teaching as what the Buddha taught.

Huseng said:

One problem that comes to mind, though, is the discrepancies between the various Nikaya and Agama canons that we have. In general the main teachings are the same, but there are discrepancies. For example comparing various Vinayas in Chinese translation I noticed that while the rule might be the same, the finer details of how and why the rule came about differ across multiple editions. For example in the prohibition against alcohol they all say Sugata got drunk and passed out after a party celebrating his placation of a naga, but the details of where he passed out and whether he kicked

the Buddha or not are all different when looking at the different editions of the Vinaya.

It doesn't seem like scribal errors to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares about Vinaya (except monks)? The various Vinayas were redacted separately. This is common knowledge even to traditional scholars.

But the sutras, this is a different stories. My point is that there is an internal consistency in early Buddhist teachings of the sutras which is very homogenous and so the intent of the Buddha cannot be doubted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

as does the abhidharma where Buddha explained the self and aggregates to exist ultimately.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha never explained anywhere that the self and the aggregates existed ultimately -- who told you he did? Vasubandhu devotes an entire chapter in the Kosha refuting the person, his main Buddhist target being the Pudgalavadins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 15th, 2012 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I just want to note that I am far more interested in what Candrakirti has to say for himself, and what Jayananda has to say about that; then what Gorampa, or Tsongkhapa or any Tibetan scholar has to say about them from here on out.

Namdrol said:

You means that skandhas and persons are conventionally non-existent?

cloudburst said:

inherent persons and aggregates, as taught in the abhidharma.

Malcolm wrote:

So in other words you accept that aggregates and persons conventionally exist. Well, it seems that the ālaya, according to Candra, also exists in that way i.e. conventionally.

(No abhidharma treatises teaches there are inherent aggregates since this contradicts the name i.e. skandha. Persons are only taught by Pudgalavadins. Atoms and moments are the main problem with Vaibhaṣikas and Sautrantikas).

cloudburst said:

What of the afflicted mind?

Malcolm wrote:

The kliṣṭāmanas is never mentioned by Candrakīrti at all in any text. This leads me to believe he has very little interest in rejecting it.

The term does occur Jayananda's Tika. I need to read what Jayananda is saying carefully. From what I can tell via a quick scan, Jayananda does not seem reject the kliṣṭāmanas outright.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Huifeng said:

The date of when things were first written down is not the key element here. Moreover, while we our present earliest manuscripts are the Gandharin, their dates are not when writing was first used.

The issue is back tracking agama stemmas; and of the traditions, we can fairly confidently do that to the point of the so-called second council, via parallel traditions.

~~ Huifeng

Malcolm wrote:

Given the Gombrich-Cousins dates, then the second council would have been between 297 and 320 somewhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

catmoon said:

Fair enough, but what what I was getting at was that since nothing was written down for centuries after the Buddha, the sutras are telling us more about the terminology used by writers two or three centuries after his time, than anything else. That's enough time time for the development of a complete religious vernacular, significant shifts in language use and so on. Of course I could be wrong, I seem to recall it happening once before....

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the best dates for the Buddha's parinirvana place it at 407-400 BCE. The Asokan Pillars were erected sometime around 260BCE. But that time the Buddhist canon was already being committed to writing. Therefore, we can imagine that the earliest the Buddhist canon was being committed to writing was within 50-75 years of the Buddha's parinirvana, and perhaps even earlier. The very latest would be 150 years afterwards.

People also forget that in the Ancient Buddhist Sangha, right from the first council there was a special class of monks trained to memorize word for word entire sections of the canon even after that canon was written down. The Buddhist sutras were not "written" by the Buddha -- but they were written by the Buddha's immediate, and awakened, disciples. Further, not only that, but many of these monks who were professional reciters were also awakened belonging to the four classes of aryas.

Our record of what the historical Buddha taught is therefore much better than what skeptics would have us believe. And as well, the content of the Pali canon is so homogenous, really, there is no doubt what the Buddha taught. And it was not what Batchelor is teaching as what the Buddha taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

All three are non-existent, taught for the benefit of those who lacked the faculties to go deeper at the time.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean that skandhas and persons are conventionally non-existent?

As for your other points, as I said before, Candrakirti is criticizing the way the Yogacarins used the term ālayavijñāna. Jayananda makes it very clear that the reason why Candrakirti cites the Lanka at them is that they have not understood their own sutras, not that we should necessarily discard the sutras. For example, the primary citation refuting svasaṃvedana comes from the Lanka itself, using the example of the edge of a sword which cannot cut itself.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 9:33 AM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

I think since I started trying to eat and live according to ayurveda this past January I let myself get a bit obsessed with trying to do everything I can to remedy my conditions and trying to "maximize the effects" of everything. Of course that kind of thinking and grasping itself is the root of at least part of my problems. I'm just gonna relax and be satisfied with the power of vimala and good ayurveda-guided nutrition-and not least of all, Dharma practice-to allow me to be happy and healthy.

So at night I'll take the bimala straight with warm boiled water instead of worrying about "maximizing" it through anupana and messing with my blood sugar. And in the morning I'll take a vata-pacifying drink of soaked & peeled raw almonds with ginger, saffron, & nutmeg blended into warmed milk which will also serve to restore ojas and I'll look into doing the colorado cleanse soon as I can. How that sound?

Namdrol said:

Sounds good. Ten year old Tawny Port is a great anupana BTW.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Cool. Hey, thanks very much for your help.

P.S.: just take a normal size portion of the port with the bimala ground up and mixed in, right?

Malcolm wrote:

No, take your vimala and enjoy your port. No need to ruin the port with some herbs. Two ounces is a usual pour for port. Goes best in a proper Reidel port glass.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

I think since I started trying to eat and live according to ayurveda this past January I let myself get a bit obsessed with trying to do everything I can to remedy my conditions and trying to "maximize the effects" of everything. Of course that kind of thinking and grasping itself is the root of at least part of my problems. I'm just gonna relax and be satisfied with the power of vimala and good ayurveda-guided nutrition-and not least of all, Dharma practice-to allow me to be happy and healthy.

So at night I'll take the bimala straight with warm boiled water instead of worrying about "maximizing" it through anupana and messing with my blood sugar. And in the morning I'll take a vata-pacifying drink of soaked & peeled raw almonds with ginger, saffron, & nutmeg blended into warmed milk which will also serve to restore ojas and I'll look into doing the colorado cleanse soon as I can. How that sound?

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds good. Ten year old Tawny Port is a great anupana BTW.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

catmoon said:

It would be interesting to see how many centuries passed before the sangha started calling themselves Buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

Almost right away -- they termed themselves "sakyaputtiyā", sons of Shakya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Sadhanas

Content:

Paul said:

I've been revisiting the Konchok Chidu sadhana I have (as mentioned in the other thread) and it's a little confusing in that it references trekchod and thogal - so it seems that there is a significant 'bleed through' between yanas in some way. Maybe it's simpler to delineate outer and inner tantras?

heart said:

Terma cycles often contain maha, anu and ati instructions within one cycle, like for example the Konchog Chidu. When I received the Lama Gongdu from Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche he said: "Lama Gongdu contains complete instructions covering the three inner Tantras, it isn't incomplete like many other cycles that contain just this or that".

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

That is a really large cycle, did he give the complete lung?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

Unknown said:

This discussion arose over a flap with Gorampa saying that although such are rejected

ultimately, this does not mean that we should not accept entities like the alaya, the manas and self-cognizers conventionally.

Malcolm wrote:

While I don't really want to discuss Gorampa, but this is not what he says, at least not in lta ba shan 'byed. He does not argue, in this text at any rate, that we must believe that Candrakirti accepts rang rig conventionally. He does assert that we must accept that Candrakirti accepts ālayavijñāna conventionally as Candrakirti presents it in the bhasyam. I believe that he does so based on how he reads Jayananda.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 14th, 2012 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

In conclusion it is as clear as ever that Chandrakirti completely rejects an Alaya which is of a different nature from the six consciousnesses, although he accepted the use of Alaya understanding the referent object to be the ultimate, and on some occasions, the mental consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are missing the point. The point is really pretty simple: Buddha used a number of terms in different sutras. If you claim that the Buddha intended the son of a barren women by using the term ālayavijñāna, then you are really doing a disservice to the Buddha's teachings -- the Buddha, as stated by Candrakirti, was referring to something conventionally acceptable.

If on the other hand you merely assert that Yogacara scholars are not correctly understanding the intent of such terms, then there is no problem. But this still gives no cause for a complete negation of the ālayavijñāna.

Again you bring up the term "rang rig" (svasamvedana). There seems to be no mention at all of a "rang rig", a "svasamvedana" in the sutras (there is, in the Lanka and Gandavyuha, frequent mention of "so sor rang rig" or "pratyatmyavedana" -- but this means "personally intuited/known" or "known for oneself", etc. rather than "self-knowing", and is a partial term, not a complete term. It is combined with many other terms such as ye shes, and so on). Careful analysis of the sutras by word search therefore suggests the term is something introduced into Buddhism through pramana. In the tantras, however the term "rang rig" appears in all classes of tantra from kriya on up. But we are discussing Madhyamaka and sutra, not tantra, so we shall leave that aside and remain focused on the actual issue at hand -- ālayavijñāna.

Further, if you look into the commentaries on the Bodhicaryāvatara, it is made abundantly clear that what is being refuted is this "svasaṃvedana" advanced in the treatises of the pramanikas -- it is stated there explicitly. The ālayavijñāna itself is not mentioned even once in the root text nor is it discussed in any of the two volumes of extant commentary we have on the text apart from a single mention in the Pañjika. Shantideva not only does not refute ālayavijñāna, he never mentions it. If you think about it, it is really kind of amazing. Therefore, comparing Santideva's refutation of svasaṃvedana with Candrakīrti's criticism of the Yogacara usage of ālayavijñāna is mistaken. The passage in the Bodhicaryāvatara refuting reflexive cognition is always presented as a refutation of Yogacara, but in reality it is actually just a refutation of Pramāṇa. It bears consequences for Yogacara, of course, but the advocates of consciousness-only [vijñānamātravadins, rnam par shes pa tsam du smra ba] are merely mentioned as an afterthought in the Pañjika.

So, you cannot equate ālayavijñāna with svasaṃvedana -- that former is the teaching of the Buddha, the latter is not. Thus in the passage I initially introduced there is no mention of svasaṃvedana:

"The ālaya exists', 'the person exists',
'only these aggregates exist'...

These three are accepted conventionally, but not necessarily in the fashion in which, for example, the Pudgalavadins might accept the statement "the person exists" when they suggest that that there is an inexpressible person which is neither the same as nor different than the aggregates.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Sadhanas

Content:

Paul said:

I've been revisiting the Konchok Chidu sadhana I have (as mentioned in the other thread) and it's a little confusing in that it references trekchod and thogal - so it seems that there is a significant 'bleed through' between yanas in some way. Maybe it's simpler to delineate outer and inner tantras?

Malcolm wrote:

\

Konchog Chidu is basically an Anuyoga system of practice. So, its view of the basis is the same as Dzogchen, and tregcho and thogal form part of its completion stage practice.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 9:26 PM
Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana
Content:

Namdrol said:
Why are you using it?

Pema Rigdzin said:
Because I understand it's balancing to all three doshas - I'm a kapha-pitta who's about 60 lbs overweight (though have lost about 15 lbs since January through eliminating processed foods and going organic), beginning to exhibit insulin resistance (although that's been entirely remedied since January through proper diet), and has anxiety and depression. Was taking semde & agar which helped a lot with the anxiety & depression, but just switched to bimala the other day after finishing the semde & agar. Also, depletion of ojas through not being so wise while recovering from a cold (and it was probably a slight bit depleted before). Right now, in process of very slowly weening myself off low dose of anxiety meds and all is going well even though I'm in college right now which is kinda stressful, though sleep has been rough. I should add that the depression & anxiety, though difficult, are relatively mild but persisistent.

So, long story short, thought the triphala might supplement the bimala to balance me, along with diet and self-massage, and also restore ojas.

Malcolm wrote:
Vimala already has triphala in it, as does Agar 35. In Tibetan medicines it used as a buffer.

If you are looking to lose weight Ayurvedically, then follow the Colorado cleanse. Depending on your diligence, you could lose 20 pounds in two weeks.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 9:41 AM
Title: Re: Identity and Dharma
Content:

Huseng said:
Here in Taiwan I would reckon that it is beneficial for people to self-identify as Buddhist. It fosters morality and perhaps a sense of dignity connected to one's sangha. If you're a prominent member in a Buddhist organization and all your colleagues know this, you might otherwise avoid questionable (or dangerous) behaviour as it would reflect poorly on your sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

It is fine to self-identify as a Buddhist, better to self-identify as a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Also, do you think it would be fine to take a tea of triphala in the A.M. while taking bimala at bedtime?

Namdrol said:

Triphala is very drying. I am not a big fan of triphala used all the time.

Pema Rigdzin said:

What about for a short period of time, while taking bimala in the PM?

Malcolm wrote:

Why are you using it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Stephie said:

IMO He's not a Buddhist - he's an academic up for a bit of stirring

Greg said:

Except that he's actually not an academic . . .

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=1548&start=400#p84434>

he's just a guy who's been bouncing around a long time and now has students who pay him money. And Tricycle editors who treat him as if he was some kind of authority.

Sometimes he's listed as affiliated with "Sharpham College," which seems to be an unaccredited fake school that he himself founded despite having no academic credentials himself.

Malcolm wrote:

That is defunct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 13th, 2012 at 5:39 AM

Title: Lemmy is God!

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, February 13th, 2012 at 4:44 AM

Title: Great Rock Band Ever! Greatest Song Ever!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is completely Buddhist in sentiment:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Also, do you think it would be fine to take a tea of triphala in the A.M. while taking bimala at bedtime?

Malcolm wrote:

Triphala is very drying. I am not a big fan of triphala used all the time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Taking bimala, question about anupana

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Namdrol la,

I saw your advice on siddhienergetics about combining bimala with warmed milk sweetened by succanat.

Do you know if using sweeteners like xylitol or stevia instead would also work?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know-- they are not traditional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Shared Reality

Content:

yadave said:

I have a simple explanation for shared reality, you do not.

Namdrol said:

Sure I do: functionality.

yadave said:

I would enjoy a better (lay person's) understanding of Buddhist functionality and how it relates to or explains shared reality.

Namdrol said:

You will find it by running a search on arthakriya and its interpretation by Chandrakirti.

yadave said:

Thanks. I see artha and kriya on Wikipedia.

Namdrol said:

The basis of shared experience depends not on real external existence, but merely whether two people might accomplish the same result given similar sets of apparent conditions.

yadave said:

Assume, for the sake of discussion, that neither you nor I are schizophrenic. We are walking and talking and see a tree and both of us point and say "Look, there is a tree."

Now suppose Russell Crowe from the movie "A Beautiful Mind" walks up, points to empty space, and says "Look, there is a tree."

What is the difference? Is it we who are schizophrenic in some weird shared way and Russell has it right?

Regards,
Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that we are enjoying a common appearance and can agree to cut down the tree. We can't agree to cut down a tree we both are not seeing. The fact that we agree there is a tree does not prove by any standard that there is real tree. We agree there is a tree because we agree to call a given appearance a tree because, ostensibly, we have a common use for such an appearance, or, to use another example, a bike.

Appearances that function are shared reality. We do not need to assert anything other than that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 12th, 2012 at 6:28 AM

Title: Re: Shared Reality

Content:

yadave said:

I have a simple explanation for shared reality, you do not.

Namdrol said:

Sure I do: functionality.

yadave said:

Hi all,

Namdrol, I can't find much on "Buddhist functionality" on- or offline. I see a theory of functionalism in philosophy of mind but think you refer to something else here. If you or anyone has a minute to spare, I would enjoy a better (lay person's) understanding of Buddhist functionality and how it relates to or explains shared reality.

Regards,

Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

You will find it by running a search on arthakriya and its interpretation by Chandrakirti.

The basis of shared experience depends not on real external existence, but merely whether two people might accomplish the same result given similar sets of apparent conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Is a Damaru necessary for the condensed Mandarava practice?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Not needed for long one either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

Well, I think there is more at stake in this discussion than that particular issue - primarily, what are the terms which constitute something to be dharma or adharma?

How about you define this for us, and we take it from there.....

Huseng said:

That which is conducive to liberation from samsara is saddharma. That which deters one away from liberation from samsara is adharma.

Rejecting rebirth constitutes a wrong view, which deters one away from liberation, and is an example of adharma.

tobes said:

By this definition, most orthodox Indian schools/traditions would be dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed and rightly so, but not Bauddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: How Germany Became Europe's Richest Country

Content:

Mr. G said:

Hmmm.....so we should demolish ourselves to improve the economy?!

Malcolm wrote:

Well that seems to be the thinking guiding the republican party.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: The Freedoms and Endowments For Dzogchen Practice

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

1) Is receiving Direct Introduction to Dzogchen equivalent to receiving the Fourth Empowerment;

2) does receiving the Direct Introduction/Fourth Empowerment automatically include the other Three Empowerments?

3) Can we be sure that receiving Dzogchen teachings from Chögyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche NOT during a Worldwide Transmission with its Empowerments in itself includes Direct Introduction if it is our intention to receive Direct Introduction?

Malcolm wrote:

1) Yes.

2) Yes, from a Dzogchen perspective.

3) Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: How Germany Became Europe's Richest Country

Content:

Mr. G said:

As European debt crisis negotiations approach the 11th hour on yet another bailout for Greece, Margaret Warner reports on some of the people behind the economic success of Germany -- Europe's richest country.

]

Malcolm wrote:

It used to be the easiest way to become the richest country in your region was to get demolished by America.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 11th, 2012 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Phoba, Phowa literal meaning

Content:
Will said:
Malcolm is a gem

Are the dictionary passages above online? There does not seem to be Devanagari, which is good, but the display is horrid. If I could look at the site directly, maybe things would clear up.

Malcolm wrote:
<http://www.sanskrit-lexicon.uni-koeln.de/scans/MWScan/tamil/index.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

It is Harvard Kyoto romanization which is horrid.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 11:31 PM
Title: Re: Phoba - Sanskrit Equivalent
Content:

Will said:
Now if you generous teachers will take another step and provide which Sanskrit term or terms 'phoba is translating.

Malcolm wrote:
jātiparivartaḥ: jāti means birthplace; parivartah means changing.

The practice of phowa is conscious rebirth in another place, such as Sukhavati. The meaning of phowa is just taking birth in the next world after dying in this one.

Then there is the native Tibetan meaning of phowa which mentioned above. The Tibetans also translated these other Sanskrit words as 'pho ba:

parivarta: %{ -vartaka} &c. see %{parivRt}, p. 601.
2 parivarta m. revolving , revolution (of a planet &c.) Su1ryas. ; a period or lapse or expiration of time (esp. of a Yuga q.v.) MBh. R. &c. ; (with %{lokAnAm}) the end of the world R. ; a year L. ; moving to and fro , stirring Prasannar. ; turning back , flight L. ; change , exchange , barter (also %{parl-v-}) Ya1jn5. MBh. Ka1v. &c. ; requital , return W. ; an abode , spot , place Hariv. ; a chapter , section , book &c. Lalit. ; N. of a son of Doh2-saha (son of Mr2ityu) Ma1rkP. [601,3] ; of the Ku1rma or 2nd incarnation of Vishn2u (also %{parl-v-}) L.
3 parlvartha m. exchange , barter Hit. (v.l.) ; N. of the Ku1rma or 2nd incarnation of Vishn2u L. (cf. %{pari-v-}). %{ -vartam} ind. (%{vRt}) in a circle , recurring , repeatedly Ta1n2d2Br.

saṃkrānti: going from one place to another , course or passage or entry into , transference to (loc. or comp.) Ka1v. Ma1rkP. ; (in astron.) passage of the sun or a planet from one sign or position in the heavens into another (e.g. %uttarA7yaNa-s-), ` " passage of the sun to its northern course " [cf. %kUTa-s-]; a day on which a principal Sam2kra1nti occurs is kept as a festival , see RTL. 428) Su1ryas. ; transference of an art (from a teacher to a pupil) Ma1lav. i , 15 , 18 ; transferring to a picture , image , reflection W. ; = %{-vAdin} Buddh. ; %{-kaumudl} f. N. of an astron. wk. ; %{-cakra} n. an astrological diagram marked with the Nakshatras and used for foretelling good or bad fortune MW. ; %{-nirNaya} m. %{-paTala} m. n. %{-prakaraNa} n. %{-phala} n. %{-lakSaNa} n. N. of wks. ; %{-vAdin} m. pl. a partic. Buddhist school ; %{-viveka} m. %{-vyavasthA-nirNaya} m. %{-zAnti} , f. ; (%{-nty}) %{-udyApana} n. N. of wks.

saṃcāra: mfn. going about , moving (see %divA-s-) ; going or belonging together , simultaneous VS. A1pS3r. ; m. (ifc. f. %A) passage , a way , road , path , place for walking (esp. the space assigned to each person who takes part in a rite) TS. S3Br. S3rS. Ka1lid. Katha1s. ; a difficult passage , defile , bridge over a torrent &c. W. ; (in Sa1m2khya) evolution , development , emanation Tattvas. ; the body L. ; killing W. ; %{-bhAgin} mfn. obtaining a share with difficulty (?) Vas. 2 saMcAra m. (ifc. f. %A) walking about , wandering , roaming , driving or riding , any motion MBh. Ka1v. &c. ; transit , passage ib. ; the passage or entrance of the sun into a new sign MW. ; passing over , transition , transference to (comp.) Ya1jn5. ; transmission (of disease) , contagion W. ; course , path , way (also fig. = ` " mode , manner ") MBh. Hariv. ; track (of wild animals) S3ak. Sch. ; course of life , career Sa1h. ; a partic. class of spies L. ; difficult progress , difficulty , distress W. ; leading , guiding ib. ; inciting , impelling ib. ; a gem supposed to be in the head of a serpent ib. ; = %huM-kAra} ChUp. ; [w.r. for %saM-cara} , %saM-sAra} , and %sac-cAra} ; %{-jlvin} m. (prob.) a tramp , vagabond L. ; %{-patha} m. a walk , walking-place Hariv. ; (in dram.) a female attendant on a king (= %yavanl}) Bhar. ; %{-pUta} mfn. purified by the course or passage (of anything) MW. ; %{-vyAdhi} m. a partic. (prob. infectious) disease L.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Some definitions please

Content:

Namdrol said:

Realization means you know the meaning and have confidence based on that; liberation means you have integrated that.

gad rgyangs said:

the meaning of what?

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever teaching you are practicing, for example: when you have realized the nature of

the mind, by integrating that realization you will be liberated.

But people also use the term by degrees i.e. basic realization, total realization (liberation), etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Phoba, Phowa literal meaning

Content:

Will said:

tantular, thanks again for your help.

Do you agree that the general or basic meaning is motion or movement?

Please give your list of actual, alternate meanings (not translation choices) other than "transference, motion, movement"

Malcolm wrote:

In the dictionary he mentioned, it give the meaning he indicated, to leave or desert ('khyur) and to depart/move ('gro ba). The second definition is states that it is a name for death ('chi ba).

'gro is a word that means move, but has a connation of moving away -- it's counterpart is 'on ba, to come. This is why dictionary glosses 'pho ba with 'gro ba; because it is emphasizing the notion of moving away from somewhere. As stated above.

Thus when we die, the mind departs and leaves for another world, for example.

However, when 'pho is combined with 'rgyur, it is a sort of fancy way of saying "change"; the example give is "there is no change ('pho 'gyur) in space."

Therefore, when it comes the exegisis of a word like 'pho ba chen po, it seems it is mostly glossed as "transformation" as if the term in full would be 'pho 'gyur chen po'i sku i.e. body of complete transformation (of the physical elements into wisdom light).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Some definitions please

Content:

pemachophel said:

Reading the topic under Mahayana about philosophical zombies makes me want to know what the Tibetan is for the following oft-used English terms:

Enlightenment
Buddhahood
Realization
Liberation
Attainment
Accomplishment

Also, if anyone (Namdrol?) would like to differentiate the practical meanings of these terms in terms of Tibetan Buddhism, I'd be much obliged. For instance, recently one of my Teachers made a distinction between realization and liberation, with realization being something less/first and liberation something more/later. Unfortunately, it wasn't appropriate at the time to ask for clarification or expansion on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Realization means you know the meaning and have confidence based on that; liberation means you have integrated that. Buddhahood, sambodhi, means you have completely eradicated all afflictions and all wisdom has expanded. Attainment usually refers to attaining a level, a realization, a liberation, a bhumi or a siddhi. Accomplishment is similar to attainment.

Enlightenment/awakening means you have begun the process of applying realization and have seen the truth. For example Buddha realized dependent origination and then applied it and then he woke up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Anders Honore said:

but I think the wish to have truly profound happiness in the here and now, can be as potent a driving force.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, that is not Buddhism, that is the vehicle of gods and men.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 7:24 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

So returning to Batchelor, emphasizing particular Buddhist methods such as meditation and mindfulness are not without value, simply because rebirth is not playing a role.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that mindfulness and meditation are not especially Buddhist. So there is no need to dress them up in Buddhism. But when you do, there are some conventions to which you ought to adhere.

If you want mindfulness and meditation without rebirth, I can suggest a number of wonderful Neo-confucian masters, such as Wang-yang Ming, and so on. But there is also no real soteriology here, apart from the experience of serenity and inner harmony.

I would suggest that Batchelor would do well to spend more time searching out such non-Buddhist meditative traditions which are more reflective of his intuitions, rather than trying to torture Buddhism into fitting his post-modernist model.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 6:49 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

But as far as I can tell, his project is mainly about emphasising existential and pragmatic elements in the sutta's, which are also clearly there in some respects.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the existential aspect of the suttas are about rebirth, and offer a pragmatic solution to that existential issue. Suffering is intimately bound up with rebirth.

Toss out rebirth, and there is no meaning to Buddha's pragmatic method. It is not pragmatic -- it's a waste of valuable time better spent getting rich, getting drunk and whoring, and running over anyone who gets in your way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

P.S.: all of you who do ChNN's Mandarava practice, do you buy chudlen pills or compile your own ingredients or what? If you buy them, where from?

pensum said:

High quality Chulen pills can also be purchased from Siddhi Energetics

<http://www.siddhienergetics.com/products/chulen>

simhanada said:

They are good, I have got them from there too. The chulen you can get from the dzogchen community (when its available) is made according to Rinpoche's terma and is specific to the Mandarava practice. Usually its also blessed by Rinpoche or at least they used to be. So that would be my first port of call with siddhi energetics second if I'm using them for Mandarava practice. The siddhi energetics one wouldn't have the exact same function I imagine?

Malcolm wrote:

As ChNN explains, these are relative considerations -- one does not need pills to do chulen. They are merely supports. You can use Chavayan prash, or anything, really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

in this very body characteristic of Vajrayana

Kirt

Namdrol said:

This means during this lifetime.

kirtu said:

Well obviously. Again, that's not the issue.

The philosophical zombie assertion is an issue.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, this is not an issue for Dzogchen. But it is an issue for Sakyapas, because they have a very literal interpretation of the Gandavyuha cosmology. Therefore for them, it is hard to accept that the two rūpakāyas are the same continuum because of various contradictions that arise. So because the Sambhogakāya is defined as the definitive rūpakāya, the nirmanakāya is relegated to a secondary status, not possessing any true motives, actions, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

in this very body characteristic of Vajrayana

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

This means during this lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 10th, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Soooo... you think putting a properly-prepared statue of Dorje Drolo on my altar would cause obstacles just by itself? I know this seems ridiculous, but I have to add something else to my basket and this seems like it would be a wise purchase if it's not going to cause me problems.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be a great purchase.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Actually you are a lot less annoying these days. In particular the last six months. I suspect you took the red pill in Teneriffe and are now heading down the rabbit-hole.
/magnus

padma norbu said:

Maybe Namkhai Norbu told him to stop.

I'd be curious to know what retreat happened in Teneriffe, though. That's the real reason I'm replying.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing, apart from receiving teachings there and eating lots of good food.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

"Well, she's annoying. I won't let her discourage me."

Namdrol said:

So are you, so good choice.

padma norbu said:

I know I'm annoying.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, lighten up, it was just a quip.

All I was really saying, is that we are sentient beings with flaws -- seeing our own helps us to be more forgiving of our own flaws in others.

If you think you are annoyung, I am much more annoying. There are whole websites devoted to how annoying I am:

<http://esanghalert.wordpress.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

If they only knew how much this inflames my ego, they would take it all down right away! But they are not kind, and so they leave it up, and my ego just gets bigger and bigger.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

Is Dzogchen found in the Pali suttas?

Namdrol said:

If you are a Dzogchenpa, of course.

tobes said:

And what do you suppose the Theravadans would say about this?

Which brings me to the only point I'm trying to make here: hermeneutical contestation - good, necessary, interesting, fruitful.

The claim of privileged hermeneutical authenticity - dubious, without basis, ideological, unfruitful.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, claims of privilege might be fraught, but not claims that this or that position represents a violation of obviously stated principles. For example, if someone were to claim that Marx was a royalist, it requires no privilege to point out that such a claim is not born out by the writings of Marx. Likewise, to claim that Buddha did not believe in rebirth, or even if he did, did not think it important, is to ignore the persistent mention of the four types of aryas found all over the Pali canon.

Basically, Buddha's Dharma takes rebirth as the central problem of existence and proposes a solution to it. This is the central axiom of Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: ChNN's pronunciation

Content:

Sherlock said:

I notice that his pronunciation of Sanskrit is a lot closer to the original than most Tibetans (e.g. Vajra instead of "benzar"). Is he atypical in this way or maybe it's just my own limited exposure to lamas?

Namdrol said:

He studied Sanskrit at Derge, and also has taken a keen interest in languages his whole life.

His pronunciation is Derge dialect from East Tibet.

mindyourmind said:

...with a wonderful tinge of Italian thrown in there somewhere

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Kirt:

It is very simple: from a Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna perspective, no one attains full awakening in the Sahaloka. Awakening occurs only on the sambhogakāya level, never the nirmanakāya level. "Nirmana" means "to emanate". Sambhohga means means "to enjoy".

In common Mahāyāna, bodhisattvas take rebirth in Akaniṣṭha then they achieve full awakening having recieved abhisheka from the all the tathagatas. No buddha actually attains awakening here.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: ChNN's pronunciation

Content:

Sherlock said:

I notice that his pronunciation of Sanskrit is a lot closer to the original than most Tibetans (e.g. Vajra instead of "benzar"). Is he atypical in this way or maybe it's just my own limited exposure to lamas?

Malcolm wrote:

He studied Sanskrit at Derge, and also has taken a keen interest in languages his whole life.

His pronunciation is Derge dialect from East Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

"Well, she's annoying. I won't let her discourage me."

Malcolm wrote:

So are you, so good choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Meh... actually, my problems probably were caused by dedicating myself to the path and then committing root downfalls. Someone brought it to my attention recently on this forum that I was "dangerously close" to committing the root downfall of discouraging others. Well, I've probably done plenty of that without meaning to. Upon re-reading the list of root downfalls, I'm sure I've committed this one: (1) Praising ourselves and/or belittling others... and (19) Belittling others with sarcastic verses or words ... and possibly (11) Teaching voidness to those whose minds are untrained. I don't think I've caused a split in a monastic community (that seems a stretch), but it's possible something I said about my experiences in the past may have caused some distress to the sangha. I don't know. Also, (18) Giving up bodhichitta ...I've definitely had several days where I say "screw it" only to come back to it later.

Hopefully, this is stuff many people go through. Some seem to take to it all quite easily, but for me it has been a long, difficult process beginning in my early 20s exploring Theravada and thinking I couldn't really give up all that, then Zen and Vajrayana and thinking roughly the same, that I didn't really have the discipline required to formally commit. When I heard about Dzogchen, I mistakenly understood it to be "easier," but as it turns out, you pretty much have to keep most of the same vows as the rest plus some additional discipline required to sort out what's different and how in your mind. All in all, it's been rough.

Do I just do Vajrasattva to purify past actions and try to be sure not to screw up in the future? Would probably be easier for me to start fresh again now if I knew how to really "clean the slate" and start over, so to speak.

Malcolm wrote:

Best purification is rigpa. After that, Guru Yoga, after that, Ganapuja.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 11:06 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Thanks. So then we could incorporate Dorje Drolo in the Tun practice with the Lung only as well?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 10:35 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Is there any benefit in having the Lung for Dorje Drolo without the Donwang?

If there is any benefit for having the Lung only, how would it be applied?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and you would recite the mantra etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Out of curiosity, Namdrol, given your preference for pronouncing mantras as closely to the Sanskrit as possible, do you personally say "Drowo" or "Krowo"? I ask because I've taken to trying to stay more faithful to the Sanskrit too, but Drollod's name seems to have been so thoroughly Tibetanized that it bears so little resemblance to its properly Sanskrit version.

Malcolm wrote:

gro bo lot is a Apabhramsa corruption of krodhalokottara according to Situ Panchen. In Sanskrit then, it means "transcendentally wrathful".

I pronounce it as Rinpoche does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

See, thats been the problem lately. It has been difficult to follow Rinpoches instructions on relaxing, being Present, and doing Guru Yoga etc. Keep running into weird shit/obstacles/problems/illnesses. Perhaps I should take a few days and do this practice for both quality and quantity.

Malcolm wrote:

That also can help. Remember what he said about mixiing it up though...pick a few practices, like Mandarava and drollo combined. Rushan and drollo, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Thanks..I really do feel a lot better now. Its just that there have been so many posts in this thread about going crazy etc..had me a little freaked out. I dont know a lot but I know not to screw around with this stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

crazy | 'krāzē| informal

adjective (crazier , craziest)

1) To lack integration and awareness

2) To be distracted by tension

3) Wisdom

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 8:02 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Are the sort of obstacles generally like highlighting your major weaknesses? Seems logical that these obstacles would just be like "here's your problem, here's your problem, here's your problem, here's your problem..." so you get the point quicker: HEY! THIS IS MY PROBLEM! And then you can deal with it?

Malcolm wrote:

The sort of obstacles that happen are things sometimes seem not to work out right, things that challenge your integration and your ability to relax.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

It is because this practice has a lot to do with pacifying the wildest of the eight classes.

This is why one should only do the action mantra with a very light touch.

Namdrol, would you mind explaining this? I already have enough problems/obstacles as it is without screwing myself up more. If you cant go into more detail in open forum

could you please PM me. Unfortunately I apparently missed some important pieces. Maybe this practice is just for more advanced practitioners and I am in over my head its just that the little I have been able to do so far (doing it in the short tun) I like the feeling of. Havent even tried the action mantra yet...would be good to know exactly what the action mantra is used for.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, Drolo is very powerful. But obviously now is the time for Drolo practice in the DC.

Drolo is used for overcoming obstacles. Also it is a complete path.

Rinpoche has mentioned that even doing such peaceful practices as Sang can sometimes caused problems if you do them in a distracted way.

Rinpoche really emphasized quality over quantity, as he often does.

But in the end, ChNN would not have taught the practice if he did not feel people could not handle it.

Just treat it with awareness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

But no one else has really bothered to actually take issue with Batchelor's interpretative argument.....by engaging with it sufficiently and offering a refutation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a self-defeating argument as he expects us to believe that Buddha did not believe what Buddha himself was saying, that Buddha was merely catering to the "primitive" and naive views of his day.

He overlooks the fact that during the time of the Buddha there were soteriological alternatives to rebirth and karma. Ajivikas mendicants rejected both.

India has a long tradition of very eloquent materialist philosophers.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:08 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

Is Dzogchen found in the Pali suttas?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a Dzogchenpa, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

Drollo practice can cause lots of obstacles.

alpha said:

Is it because this kind of practice leads to an intensification of strong emotions ,anger,hatred..etc..?

And also is it that because they become more apparent and readily available(these emotions) would make resting in rigpa much more easy ???

Malcolm wrote:

It is because this practice has a lot to do with pacifying the wildest of the eight classes.

This is why one should only do the action mantra with a very light touch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Buddha denied he was a human being when the question was put to him.

AilurusFulgens said:

This is fascinating! If Buddha is not a human being, then who or what is he?

Malcolm wrote:

His answer was that he was a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

If my mind is transformed into wisdom then I have attained liberation at some level in an impure dimension.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

kirtu said:

You are proposing that at least some high (in terms of attainment) lama's and masters are not actually human.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha denied he was a human being when the question was put to him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 9th, 2012 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

See this is highly problematic. It's one thing to assert that this is the case for Buddha nirmanakayas : actual Buddhahood occurs in Akanistha (fine) and then an emanation play acts (either for real or in effect). However this restricts mere sentient beings from attaining full enlightenment at least in this lifetime. That can be resolved by asserting that sentient beings actually don't attain enlightenment in this lifetime - it really happens after death in Akanistha, etc.

Namdrol said:

In common Mahāyāna, buddhahood only happens after one becomes a Mahāyāna never returner, and can see the Sambhogakāya i.e. eighth bhumi onward.

STMT2: However, in Vajrayāna, we are trained to understand how to realize Sambhogakāya buddhahood through mandala practice. This is another reason why Vajrayāna is fast.

STMT3: So we never really ever achieve buddhahood in the saḥāloka dhātu.

kirtu said:

How can you justify stmt3 as a conclusion on the basis of stmt2? It doesn't seem to necessarily follow.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

There is no attainment of buddhahood in impure dimensions. This is the purpose of path of transformation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Further, you say Batchelor is not trying to recreate the Buddha's experience. I think he would disagree here also.

Malcolm wrote:

If he were, he would be spending time trying to remember his past lives, rather than speculatively rejecting the notion and reinterpreting karma to suit his physicalist views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolö retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

I just sounds like he's saying "Torlay" to me. Dorje Torlay. Is that right?

I'm asking because the mantra has "guru grovolod" in it and I know it's not going to be easy to decipher by listening to the replay.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is saying Dorje Drolö.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolö retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

I don't understand the pronunciation of these two based on the spelling: Dragphur and Drolö. Namkhai Norbu seems to shift the "r" to a different location, similar to the way

Brett Favre's last name is pronounced "Farv" which is clearly transposing the "v" and "r".

Malcolm wrote:

ལྷོ་ལོ་ཏ་ is pronounced:

drölöt

Elongate the first ō to double the length. So it is not "dro wo" as pronounced in some other traditions. ChNN clearly explained that in this case, the 'wo' (ལོ) is merely elongating the o sound and the 'w' part is elided in pronunciation.

Second o has an umlaut, this is a feature of Tibetan pronunciation of o when there is a final consonant that sounds to us like it has a 'r' sound in it, but it doesn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

See this is highly problematic. It's one thing to assert that this is the case for Buddha nirmanakayas : actual Buddhahood occurs in Akanistha (fine) and then an emanation play acts (either for real or in effect). However this restricts mere sentient beings from attaining full enlightenment at least in this lifetime. That can be resolved by asserting that sentient beings actually don't attain enlightenment in this lifetime - it really happens after death in Akanistha, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

In common Mahāyāna, buddhahood only happens after one becomes a Mahāyāna never returner, and can see the Sambhogakāya i.e. eighth bhumi onward.

However, in Vajrayāna, we are trained to understand how to realize Sambhogakāya buddhahood through mandala practice. This is another reason why Vajrayāna is fast.

So we never really ever achieve buddhahood in the sahāloka dhātu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

alpha said:

Can someone Pm me with a brief summary of the anuyoga style Dorje Drolo given in the second day?

I got lost at the point where Rinpoche started to mention the action mantra and just

before blue Hung or the 3 Hung's. And how do you conclude the practice? He doesn't say.

And in this short version are we visualizing the mantra as he explained before when he said that we can do the practice of Dorje Drollo like in Tun when we replace Guru Thragpur?

Also in the 3rd day I didn't understand a word he said when he started to explain the very essential practice with the Hung in the Ati style. There was lots of Dzogchen jargon in there and I got completely lost. What are you supposed to do in this practice?

I would really appreciate it.
Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:
Just put it in the short or medium thuns, substituting it for Dragphur.

I will pm you separately on the other.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 11:21 AM
Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"
Content:

tobes said:
However, I think he was pretty explicit that this was his particular interpretation;

Malcolm wrote:
No, his works present his POV as Buddha's POV.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 7:10 AM
Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?
Content:

Namdrol said:
He points out that if the nirmankāya and Sambhogakāya were the same continuum, then when the Buddha stepped on an acacia thorn, Vairocana in Akanistha would have been harmed. He therefore, states that the relationship between Sambhogakāyas and Nirmankāyas are like that of illusionists and illusions. However, what he was referring to was puppet shows, since that is actually the kind of illusion being discussed in that example i.e. taking clods of earth, sticks and so on, and causing the illusions of people, elephants and so on to appear on a screen.

kirtu said:

Where does Gorampa discuss this?

Gorampa's argument is not really logical (that must score max points for some kind of combination of irony and arrogance on my part) and is constrained to a particular interpretation or sets of interpretations. Your paragraph explanation can be debated but well, I lack the background to debate this seriously.

If considered seriously a nirmanakaya as a *puppet* is problematic on many levels (for one thing this can be seen as denying liberation at the level of Buddhahood). As an emanation and thus a kind of illusion (but not a puppet) this is not problematic.

Even the case of Shakyamuni is problematic with this puppet interpretation while attaining full enlightenment in the remote past and then enacting (or playacting) the twelve deeds isn't.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

It is based on the idea, stated in the Lanka and elsewhere, that actual Buddhahood occurs in Akaniṣṭha Gandavyuha, and that nirmankāyas only seem to achieve buddhahood here. In other words, they are merely projections of the Sambogakāya, they are sort of philosophical zombies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

Where does Gorampa discuss this?

Malcolm wrote:

His commentary on Sapan's three vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

tobes said:

Batchelor at least, to his credit, does make such a claim, nor speak from such a

position.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be silly -- he certainly makes such claims, like everyone, putting them in the mouth of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 8th, 2012 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Anyone know what pages in Adzom Drugpa works from TBRC where the Drollo tsog is?

/magnus

Namdrol said:

It is part of medium activity manual, and the feast itself starts on page 72.

heart said:

Thank you Namdrol! So from the the longer and shorter sadhanas and activity manuals Rinpoche is giving the essence of the concise daily practice?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

This another sadhana, called the rgyun khyer, page 133-135. This is what he again gave the short lung for today.

Then of course, one can do it in the short thun, etc., in all the ways rinpoche mentioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

The advice he is giving today is fantastic. A lot of detail about many things. I am not sure if these last days of retreat are usually available as replays due to the fact that the last day is mostly reading of lungs, but I hope this one is since there is pronunciation advice and practice advice, etc. which is hard to get all at once without being able to pause and rewind if necessary.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, generally they are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Anyone know what pages in Adzom Drugpa works from TBRC where the Drollo tsog is?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is part of medium activity manual, and the feast itself starts on page 72.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Aalaya and Neutral awareness

Content:

Daniel Arraes said:

Can one say that, according to Dzogchen, Aalaya (kun-gzhi) and the neutral awareness (shes-pa-lung-ma-bstan) are the same thing?

Namdrol said:

No, they are different. The ālaya is ignorance.

Daniel Arraes said:

What type of ignorance: innate or imputing?

Malcolm wrote:

Imputing since it is afflicted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 11:54 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

Awareness can not be seen without a reflection.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence paths based on mind are limited and insufficient for liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 11:44 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

However, the nirmanakaya is not a puppet in the world...

Namdrol said:

That is exactly how Gorampa describes it, in point of fact.

kirtu said:

What does he base that upon?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

He points out that if the nirmankāya and Sambhogakāya were the same continuum, then when the Buddha stepped on an acacia thorn, Vairocana in Akanistha would have been harmed. He therefore, states that the relationship between Sambhogakāyas and Nirmankāyas are like that of illusionists and illusions. However, what he was referring to was puppet shows, since that is actually the kind of illusion being discussed in that example i.e. taking clods of earth, sticks and so on, and causing the illusions of people, elephants and so on to appear on a screen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 11:38 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It is kept away not for safety, but for profit.

Malcolm wrote:

Secret just means don't share things with people a) when they are not interested b) one does not have the proper qualifications to share them properly (i.e. experience).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: are nirmanakayas, "philosophical zombies"?

Content:

kirtu said:

However, the nirmanakaya is not a puppet in the world...

Malcolm wrote:

That is exactly how Gorampa describes it, in point of fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 8:05 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

Namdrol said:

You responded with a cracked mirror. Apparently, some subtleties are lost even on you.

teknix said:

I am sure there are some that are. It maybe lost on me, or the response could just as well be lost on you.

Malcolm wrote:

When one holds up one finger, the other should hold up one finger. If the other holds up two fingers, it means the other does not understand.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 8:01 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It is often the case when ones beliefs come into question, a self-defense mechanism designed to contain energy within a given structure or form is unleashed to aid in justifying the falseness.

Namdrol said:

But you have not questioned anyone's beleifs. You have merely proffered your own.

teknix said:

I do not hold any beliefs that I am aware of, maybe you could point them out for me.

Malcolm wrote:

You responded with a cracked mirror. Apparently, some subtleties are lost even to you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It takes an ego to point at an ego.

Namdrol said:

And?

teknix said:

The subtlety is that the accuser is the one displaying ego.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so when you said that "Let's see how bloated these ego's are" you admit then that you are merely displaying your own ego, correct?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:57 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It is often the case when ones beliefs come into question, a self-defense mechanism designed to contain energy within a given structure or form is unleashed to aid in justifying the falseness.

Malcolm wrote:

But you have not questioned anyone's beliefs. You have merely proffered your own.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

It takes an ego to point at an ego.

Malcolm wrote:

And?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

Let's see how bloated these ego's are.

Namdrol said:

You might have to deflate your own a little, to make some room.

teknix said:

It takes an ego to point at an ego.

You may interpret my confidence however you choose, that is your right, although it does NOT say anything about me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: teknix's Views

Content:

teknix said:

Let's see how bloated these ego's are.

Malcolm wrote:

You might have to deflate your own a little, to make some room.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Aalaya and Neutral awareness

Content:

Daniel Arraes said:

Can one say that, according to Dzogchen, Aalaya (kun-gzhi) and the neutral awareness (shes-pa-lung-ma-bstan) are the same thing?

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are different. The ālaya is ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

MrDistracted said:

Yes, awesome. These are the first teachings, other than reading Crystal and the Way of Light that I've received from Rinpoche, it's pretty mindblowing.

Did I hear it right that he said that he would give the donwang again tomorrow because of the bad connection yesterday?

Malcolm wrote:

I think so, in a more essential way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 7th, 2012 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Rigpa vs. Alaya

Content:

Clarence said:

Having listened to CNN for some time now, I would like to ask a question which has been going around in my mind lately.

In Chokyi Nyima Rinpoche's book Indisputable Truth he describes how there are 3 obstacles to the "experience" of Rigpa, namely:

- Indifference. This is where you confuse being indifferent and not caring with being in Rigpa. (This one I understand)

- Letting thoughts run wild. This is where you think that since there is nothing to do and thoughts are Rigpa you just let your monkey mind run free. (This I also understand)

- Confusing the experience of Alaya all-ground for Rigpa. Apparently they are very similar. (So, this one I don't understand.)

I started reading Thrangu Rinpoche's commentary on Distinguishing Consciousness from Wisdom and hope that will help clarify things a little but for now, how can one be sure and how do the experiences differ?

Many thanks. C

Malcolm wrote:

Ālaya, in Dzogchen generally is considered ignorance. They reason they are similar is that they have the same basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 6th, 2012 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Kalu Rinpoche shocking news!

Content:

Unknown said:

Why don't you go ask the Dalai Lama, the 17th Karmapa, Tai Situ Rinpoche etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

The general Tibetan cultural approach to problems is to close one's eyes so that they disappear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 6th, 2012 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: How would you translate this sentence?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

sentient beings of deluded dualistic vision/appearances

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 5th, 2012 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

To all people freaking out about whether they got this or not, relax, you did.

As long as you participated as best you could you got it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 5th, 2012 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

heart said:

Anyone got the "dokpa" and can share it?

/magnus

Mr. G said:

It's in the short tun.

heart said:

I doubt it was the same, it sounded drollo related to me.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is in the short thun.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

I noticed that he said he gave transmission today. While he was saying the mantras, both times he said it, my connection paused. It was also delayed by about 3 or 4 minutes anyway from the audio. So... I really don't think I received transmission.

Is the initiation tomorrow all I will really need?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and really, don't get so locked into concepts -- for example, it even takes some time for sound to travel through air in the same room. If you obsess about things like this, you will never overcome doubt.

As long as you heard it, then you received it. He intended you to receive it, you intended to receive it, therefore, the transmission is perfect, ok?

Tomorrow, just listen to the audio feed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

A few days ago when the webcast was closed I downloaded the file. I just now downloaded the newer file and the primary mantra has a one word addition, (dont want to repeat it in open forum) which one do I use?

Mr. G said:

I downloaded the file yesterday. Following along with the webcast, it seemed to match. Perhaps Namdrol or Nangwa can comment on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Use the later one. The earlier one had a typo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 10:52 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

I dont mean to be a pest but if one is already doing Guru Tragphur what would the difference/benefit be from doing this practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Drollo is more connected with Dzogchen explicitly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 7:52 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

michaelb said:

Oh, I see.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a question of shifting lingo from one dharma scene to another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

michaelb said:

Oh, I must have misunderstood that bit. What form the the transmission take? I suppose I was expecting a bit of a shout and that.

Malcolm wrote:

he explained Guru YOga of white A. That is transmission -- transmission and introduction are two different things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Mr. G said:

I decided to take a day off work Sunday for the Donwang. However, I may miss Monday and Tuesday.

I was wondering, Will this still enable me to practice Drolo in the future if I wanted to, and be OK for me to replay the instructions for Monday and Tuesday?

Malcolm wrote:

Better you also take off monday, however, it is as eight am eastern time, so maybe you can just be late

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

michaelb said:

I don't think he gave Guru Yoga transmission.

Malcolm wrote:

He gave transmission for Guru Yoga-- he clearly said so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Fa Dao said:

TBRC??

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center -- the largest online repository of Tibetan texts in the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 4th, 2012 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is only one way to be a text translator. Just do it.

First read a lot of books for five years and learn Dharma. Then learn source language. Meanwhile practice as much as you can.

Then, having learned the source language's grammar, practice in that language and

translate the shit out of texts for 6-10 years before you even produce something worthwhile. Spend the next ten years polishing your craft. Minimum 60 hours a week working on translations. Read books the rest of the time, when you are not practicing. Do not, under any circumstances, join a Buddhist studies program and so on. Do not expect to make a living. Expect to be poor for many years.

If you want to translate, learn the grammar, start translating and ask qualified people to look at your stuff -- oh and study Abhidharma first.

If you are a poor writer in English, either improve your English skills or abandon hope because your translations will always be hopeless garbage even if you have understood the texts. There is so much hopeless garbage out there it seems we will never dig our way out of it.

Having the blessings of your guru helps.

Many days I generally work from 8 am to around 9 pm, usually without much of a break. I don't do it to get paid, I do it because I love it. For example, this morning I began at 7 am. It is 10 pm. I am still working.

Also remember, if you are happy with your translation, it probably sucks.

N

Mr. G said:
Namdrol,

Have you ever thought of running a course like the Tibetan Language Institute for those that want to learn how to translate texts for their own personal use? A combination of video lectures online, forum discussion, and personal tutoring options? It'd be a great way for beginners to avoid the pitfalls that others have gone through in attempting to learn by themselves.

Malcolm wrote:
I have been asked to teach others in the past, but no one stays with the program.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:31 PM
Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators
Content:
Will said:

It is good that enough rugged individualists have trod the narrow, winding path of Dharma translation into English that we have what we have now. But it is bad for the future if only a few 'hobbyists' decide to do this work.

Malcolm wrote:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:08 PM
Title: Re: What are 84000 teachings?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
You are on your own from here on out.

DarwidHalim said:
I think Ananda must have meaning buy saying 82000 from Buddha.

In Vajrayana context For example, the scholars say tantric teachings are inside this 84000 teachings.

So, if they claimed so, they themselves must have the complete 84000 teachings all must be in Pali.

This is a source of gray area and dispute.

I dont think Ananda will say 84000 as many many teachings. He can use as many Gangga sands or other fancy term.

21000 techniques to handle ignorance?

21000 types of ignorance?

21000 way we get ignorance?

Or what?

Malcolm wrote:

Originally, it was a number enunciated by Ananda. It is a way of saying, for every problem there is a solution. It is just a convention. In reality, afflictions are innumerable, and so are dharma teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: What are 84000 teachings?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

They are calculated from 21,000 afflictions of desire, 21,000 afflictions of hatred, 21,000 afflictions of ignorance and 21,000 combined afflictions = 84,000. Thus, there is a dharma teaching for each affliction.

Ok. What are the title of each those teachings for ignorance for example?

They are 21000. That is a lot. What is the name for each 21000 items?

Malcolm wrote:

Sutra for anger, vinaya for desire, abhidharma for ignorance, and so on.

But there isn't 84,000 names of dharma teachings for 84,000 individually named afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: What are 84000 teachings?

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

I have heard about this term 84000 teachings both in Mahayana and Theravada teachings?

What does it mean?

How do they calculate this number?

Is it like 1. Anapasatti Sutta 2. Prajna paramitha Sutta, 3. Xxxx, etc. ?

How many of them in Pali and how many of them in Sankrit? Other language?

Or 84000 teachings are just symbolic meaning? In this case why the number is 84000?

Malcolm wrote:

They are calculated from 21,000 afflictions of desire, 21,000 afflictions of hatred, 21,000 afflictions of ignorance and 21,000 combined afflictions = 84,000. Thus, there is a dharma teaching for each affliction.

Another way of calculating it is the eighty thousand dharma skandhas, mentioned in Abhidharma; 20 thousands dharma skandhas of sutra, abhidharma, vinaya, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

MrDistracted said:

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Just be aware, my course is more of a "How do you read the Kosha", rather than a line by line exposition. I cover the high points mainly, trying to make it practical Vajrayāna and Dzogchen practitioners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

Yes, there is indeed a short sadhana, you can find it on TBRC.

Nangwa said:

Do you know where it is in the files?

I have a pretty large Adzom Drukpa Drolo file from TBRC but have no idea where the short sadhana is in there.

Malcolm wrote:

Pg. 133-135

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://rsl-ne.com/abhidharma1.shtml> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Will said:

Why avoid Buddhist studies' programs N. ?

Namdrol said:

Because they mostly fill one with bias, and give one false sense of accomplishment.

Will said:

But is the Dharma language learning part (which I thought was mandatory) so terrible?

Malcolm wrote:

In most Academic Buddhist studies programs, you are being trained to be teacher not a translator.

In the non-Academic ones, you are being trained to propagate a lineage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

zerwe said:

FPMT has the Lotsawa Rinchen Zangpo Translator Programme includes two years of classroom study in Dharamsala and two years serving as translator to a resident Geshe in centers worldwide. I will put this out there for Namdrol that, although FPMT are Gelug, I have encountered nothing but a very open non-sectarian style of presenting the Dharma in my 2+ years as a practitioner within this organization. I am sure others might have a different view, but that is my two cents.

Shaun

Malcolm wrote:

By bias I don't mean sectarian, I mean that one will be conditioned by a given school's way of presenting things. There is a difference between bias and sectarianism. To be a good translator, you have to be familiar with all kinds of things and scholastic bias causes one to have blinders.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

Does anybody know if they'll post a copy of the full Sadhana on the webcast page, or if not, does anybody have a PDF of it?

Namdrol said:

It is already up.

The full sadhana consists of a seed syllable and two mantras. That is just how we roll in the DC.

N

heart said:

Yes, but how did Adzom Drugpa roll? For sure there is a sadhana, right?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is indeed a short sadhana, you can find it on TBRC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:42 AM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Will said:

Why avoid Buddhist studies' programs N. ?

Malcolm wrote:

Because they mostly fill one with bias, and give one false sense of accomplishment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:18 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

Does anybody know if they'll post a copy of the full Sadhana on the webcast page, or if not, does anybody have a PDF of it?

Malcolm wrote:

It is already up.

The full sadhana consists of a seed syllable and two mantras. That is just how we roll in the DC.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Schools for Aspiring Translators

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is only one way to be a text translator. Just do it.

First read a lot of books for five years and learn Dharma. Then learn source language. Meanwhile practice as much as you can.

Then, having learned the source language's grammar, practice in that language and translate the shit out of texts for 6-10 years before you even produce something worthwhile. Spend the next ten years polishing your craft. Minimum 60 hours a week working on translations. Read books the rest of the time, when you are not practicing. Do not, under any circumstances, join a Buddhist studies program and so on. Do not expect to make a living. Expect to be poor for many years.

If you want to translate, learn the grammar, start translating and ask qualified people to look at your stuff -- oh and study Abhidharma first.

If you are a poor writer in English, either improve your English skills or abandon hope because your translations will always be hopeless garbage even if you have understood the texts. There is so much hopeless garbage out there it seems we will never dig our way out of it.

Having the blessings of your guru helps.

Many days I generally work from 8 am to around 9 pm, usually without much of a break. I don't do it to get paid, I do it because I love it. For example, this morning I began at 7 am. It is 10 pm. I am still working.

Also remember, if you are happy with your translation, it probably sucks.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

I'm not sure the "Three Natures" is completely irrelevant, I think it has some value--even if it's "wrong." After all, it takes a mind, even one that doesn't ultimately exist, to even say that things are empty or come to that (non)conclusion! There's some soteriological value to some of these concepts and ideas.....But I certainly can't disagree with your assessments about "revisionism," or about the confusion regarding what "early" or "True" Yogacara's positions and doctrines were, given the plethora of late Indian versions, and the Tibetan penchant for logorrhoea.

BTW, speaking of "frameworks of Buddhist philosophy," I bet you love Kongtrul's "Secret Mantra Madhyamaka," the apex of that portion of the Sheja Dzod, eh?

Malcolm wrote:

There is some justification for Dolbupa's position in so-called the three bodhisattva commentaries i.e. on Kalacakra, Hevajra, and Cakrasamvara.

What is clear to me is the rigid typological boundaries in the four tenet systems tend to fall apart when it comes to Vajrayāna, since in Vajrayāna, the view is not an intellectual construct, but rather, an experiential introduction. That being the case, whether one's intellectual view is cittamatra or madhyamaka is not very important since one's practice will be based on the view communicated during the empowerment, not a view arrived at analytically.

However, here we are discussing emptiness in yogacara, and whether it really is true that they posit non-dual consciousness that substantially exists. I think in face of the evidence it is a little hard to deny that in fact they did so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

Interesting, also, that even in India there were a variety of interpretations.

Malcolm wrote:

Not until quite late. The salient point is that Maitreyanatha, Asanga, and Vasubandhu all use the type 1 presentation which means they all were cittamatrins by gshan stong pa standards.

conebeckham said:

As an aside, I tend to think of all this ultimately as less about ontology, and more about practice and experience. I always come to the conclusion that conceptual mind cannot directly know reality, much less formulate some sort of framework describing it.

Malcolm wrote:

The issue has been, as always, whether post-Yogacara Madhyamakas like Bhavaviveka were justified in their critiques of Maitreyanatha, Asanga, and Vasubandhu.

It is clear that after the attacks of Bhavaviveka and so on on the Yogacara school, that there was a response which involved a) altering the Perfection of Wisdom in 25 and 18 thousand lines with the addition of the Maitreya chapter in order to b) provide justification of the reworking the three nature model.

Basically, we can identify three phases of Yogacara: the sutra period, original commentatator period, and the post-Madhyamaka response period.

What we observe in period two is trenchant attacks by Asanga in particular on the austerity of the perfection of wisdom vision and a concern that it lead to a form of annihilationism.

What we observe in period three is a revamping of Yogacara, recasting the three natures in terms of the two truths.

This latter phase represents a defeat for the Yogacara system in general, since the three natures are completely unnecessary given the presentation of two truths. However, late Yogacarins managed to communicate their ideas to Tibet, and since the time of Dolbupa, centuries of followers of gshan stong have been seriously confused about what the actual teaching of Maitreyanatha, Asanga, and Vasubandhu might have been, especially as this has been conflated with the tathagatagarbha theory.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

Cake? What cake? Who said anything about cake...???

Malcolm wrote:

Read this, especially the conclusion.

<http://wordpress.tsadra.org/?p=1215> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Uncontrived

Content:

Beatzen said:

I think it's ironic that ritualists like Tibetan buddhists criticize anything about zazen as

contrived.

Malcolm wrote:

If you think you can sum Tibetan Buddhism up as ritualist, it means you have not understood anything at all about Tibetan Buddhism.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 3rd, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Using a mala

Content:

MalaBeads said:

I am interested in buying a mala. I have heard that different malas are used for different mantras. I would like to do Tara and Chenrezig mantras mostly. What kind of mala should I buy

Malcolm wrote:

You should get a bodhiseed mālā since the Buddhist tantras state quite clearly this is preferred general purpose mālā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As an aside, what the Madhyamakas are trying to explain to the Yogacarin is that they cannot have their cake and eat it too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Looks like it's an open webcast after all!

This is from an email I got from Conway, MA:

3rd Feb.

4-6pm. - Introduction of this retreat teaching and the transmission of Ati Guru Yoga.

^ is that the correct US time and is that when the Dorje Drolo wang will be given?

...or more likely this day:

5th Feb.

10-12am. - Donwang of Guru Dorje Drolod and the instruction for doing the practice of Dorje Drolod in daily life.

Donwang appears to have the word "wang" in it.

Again, are these the correct US times? No need to add or subtract 2 or 3 hours? I pretty much always miss these things. Don't want to miss this one.

Malcolm wrote:

Argentina is two hours ahead of NY, so when the retreat starts at 4:00 pm, tune in at 2:00 pm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

well, yes, thats what they say, but I'll be damned if it makes any sense at all.

Malcolm wrote:

It makes sense: for them, paratantra is like a cloth; when it is dirty it is made dirty through the imagination of the false; but the dirt does not inhere to the cloth, when it is removed, it is perfect.

In reality, it is just an attempt to explain the Buddha's statement here:

"Luminous, monks, is the mind. [paratanta] And it is defiled by incoming defilements." [parikalpita]

"Luminous, monks, is the mind. [paratanta] And it is freed from incoming defilements." [parinispanna]

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/an/an01/an01.049.than.html>
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Thanissaro mentions that the commentaries mention that this refers to the bhavanga citta, and we know for a fact that the Asanga equates the bhavanga citta with the ālayavijñāna.

For the yogacara, the emptiness of the mind lies in its innate freedom from affliction, this is why in the passage above that I introduced Vasubandhu terms this emptiness "unconditioned" while the imagination of the false is termed "conditioned".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 9:08 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if the alaya is a designation only, then what kind of reality does it have beyond being parikalpita? if the seeds that are the basis of that designation is what is being called paratantra then, when there are "no more seeds", what is left? you said "a non-dual consciousness... now called wisdom" but what is that basis for that designation?

Malcolm wrote:

The non-dual consciousness is present from the beginning. This is why Yogacaras use the three own natures.

Paratantra is not parikalpita. Please don't confuse yourself and others by misusing these terms.

"The imagination (parikalpita) of the unreal exists (paratantra), duality does not exist (parinispanna) in that (paratantra).

Therefore, the basis of the designation for wisdom is paratantra in which the seeds have been removed [as the result of the transformation in the basis]. When the seeds have not been removed, paratantra is termed ālayavijñāna. The other seven consciousnesses are termed parikalpita, they are themselves the seeds which function dualistically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Uncontrived

Content:

Beatzen said:

But in zazen, we aren't doing such things. Steadying the mind on the breath in the tanden region, we empty our mind of its contents and relax into glimpsing our original face.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a pretty contrived meditation, from this Tibetan Buddhist's POV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

Anders Honore said:

I freely admit, I am more interested in interpreting Yogacara prescriptively than descriptively. So my point of curiosity in this is: Without regard for what yogacara scholars may be saying about their own texts, is yogacara necessarily realist?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as your citation below shows.

Anders Honore said:

le, you say yogacara goofed on the whole transformation thing, but did they have to commit this fallacy to retain the integrity of their system or not? I am thinking of passages like this from the platform sutra:

Although the sixth and seventh are transformed within the cause, the [first] five and the eighth are transformed on the basis of the result. Only the names are transformed; the [consciousnesses] are not transformed in their essences.)

Which strikes me as a simple solution to the controversy. If it is indeed so, it does make me wonder why the yogacarins were allegedly so vested in not opting for this solution.

Malcolm wrote:

This passage means that Yogacarins are cittamatrins.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

the whole paratantra thing was parikalpita from the start.

Malcolm wrote:

This is one reason I find it unrewarding to have this discussion, as most people are incapable of weeding out how gzhan stong pas present the three natures [as you have above] and the way Yogacara scholars in India actually present them.

If, as you suggest, paratantra is parikalpita, then you are asserting that parinispanna is also completely non-existent. Why? Because the yogacara authors very clearly explain that the absence parikalpita in paratantra is parinispanna. This bears that consequence that paratantra must exist.

In any event, I did not invent the term āśrayaḥ parivarta. You can blame Yogacarins for that. If you carefully examine their literature, they are indeed asserting that there is a transformation of the kind described. This is especially clear in the Mahāyāna samgraha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 5:43 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

Mariusz said:

Are Bhaviveka and Candrakirti, Santarakṣita the Madhyamikas, who did not "never locate reference points"?

Namdrol said:

You should read them for yourself and find out what they think.

Mariusz said:

I can not find suitable english books these days. Can you recommend any books which deals directly with what I asked? As far as I know the quotes from Candrakirti, He never located reference points in the Two Truths, but for the purpose of the debate to help others understand Madhyamka He sometimes used suitable reference points as the "antidote, medicine" for them only. To free them "from all reference points", from clinging to the Two Truths, the freedom "beyond" the seeming=unblurred, unimpaired vision.

Malcolm wrote:

Procure and read Nāgārjuna's Reason Sixty. A somewhat clumsy translation, to be sure, but it has Candrakirti's commentary. Incidentally, Candrakirti's densest treatment of worldly convention seems to be contained in his commentary on the seventy verses on emptiness.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

Regarding your comments about the internal contradiction in the three natures, my understanding of the Three Natures is that the False Nature is purely imaginary, thus obviously nonexistent, the Dependent nature is empty dependent origination, and the Perfect nature is neither existent nor nonexistent.

Malcolm wrote:

And this is a perfectly gzhan stong interpretation.

The way this is parsed in authentic Yogacara texts is that the non-existence of the imagined in the dependent is the perfected nature. Hence the citation above states that the imagination of the false is empty and not empty as well has existence, non-existence, and as well as existence.

The ālayavijñāna is the dependent nature; when the seeds within it are exhausted, there

is a transformation in the basis, it's nature as the ālayavijñāna ceases, becoming wisdom. Why? The Yogacara designate the ālayavijñāna based upon the storage of seeds. When there are no more seeds, then there is no basis for designation of a container or storage place of seeds. What remains is a non-dual consciousness. That is not longer termed "mind", it is now termed "wisdom".

The sole thing that is refuted by the Yogacara school as being non-existent is duality. Duality does not exist in the imagination of the unreal. But the imagination itself exists. It's emptiness is solely emptiness of the unreal.

For this reason then we can understand their school is a non-dual realism i.e. "everything is not only empty".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Doctors, please read

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Would Chulen that is taken for the purpose of needing less sleep and having more energy for a retreat, have to be taken according to the instructions that Padma Norbu posted in the original post?

Or could these said Chudlen be taken the same way as say Bimala or Semde?

Malcolm wrote:

Chulen pills have a method of being blessed as in Mandarava practice, so use that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness in Yogacara

Content:

conebeckham said:

Do we agree that the real question, regarding Yogacara, is not whether Buddhahood is the result of transformation or revaluation, but whether Yogacaras posit an absolute existent, such that they are to be considered "realists?"

Malcolm wrote:

The two questions are inextricably related. The Tibetan gzhan stong debates have caused the issue to become skewed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

conebeckham said:

In fact, Eighth Karmapa's commentary on the Abhisamayalamkara indicates that it is a mistake to think that, for instance, the Alayavijnana turns into Mirror-like wisdom, as many Mahamudra practitioners do. He says it is "not possible within the sphere of knowable objects that something impure turns into something pure," or vice versa.

Malcolm wrote:

This nevertheless is the fault of the yogacara school, the inner contradiction of their position that dependent nature must exist since it is what imagines the false. You must read very carefully what Vasubandhu says in the citation above.

The Karmapa's commentary, incidentally, will be based on either Ārya Vimuktisena's commentary Haribhadr's or a combination of both, depending whether he prefers a three kāya scheme following the former, or a four kāya scheme following the latter, so his commentary on that will hardly be relevant here.

We are discussing what Yogacara scholars say about their own texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

Mariusz said:

Are Bhaviveka and Candrakirti, Santarakṣita the Madhyamikas, who did not "never locate reference points"?

Malcolm wrote:

You should read them for yourself and find out what they think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

conebeckham said:

Mahayanasutralamkara, VI. 8:

The mind that is aware that nothing other than mind exists.

Then, it is realized that mind does not exist either.

The intelligent ones are aware that both do not exist

and abide in the Dharmadhatu, in which these are absent.
This would lead to "revealed," rather than transformed, yes?
Though it's true the Yogacara texts are constantly going on about the "fundamental change of state."

Malcolm wrote:

My response to this is the evidence provided in the Madhyāntavibhagatīka:

As it is said:

"The imagination of the unreal exists,
duality does not exist in that,
emptiness exists in this,
that also exists in that.

Now then, the imagination of the false means the concept of an apprehended object and the apprehending subject. Duality means free from a real apprehended object and an apprehending subject. Emptiness means the imagination of the false being free from a real apprehended object and an apprehending subject. "That also exists in that" means the imagination of the false. As such, that non-existence of something somewhere, that is truly seeing the empty truly just as it is. Whatever remains here, that is understood just as it truly is to exist here. As such, the characteristic of emptiness is demonstrated without mistake.

Not empty and not not empty,
in that way is everything explained,
because of existence, because of non-existence, because of existence,
that is the middle path.

"It is not empty" means emptiness and the imagination of the false. "It is not not-empty" means duality i.e. the apprehended object and an apprehending subject. 'Everything' means 'the imagination of the false' is the conditioned and 'emptiness' is the unconditioned. 'Explained' means demonstrated. 'Exists' means the imagination of the false. 'Non-existence' means duality. 'Existence' means emptiness exists in the imagination of the false, and the imagination of the false exists in that too. "That is the middle path" means everything is not only empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

Namdrol said:

What they propose is that a mind freed from subject object transforms into wisdom, and if this wisdom does not really exist, liberation is impossible. In order for this wisdom to exist, then the mind out of which wisdom is transformed necessarily must exist. Yogacara thus becomes a non-dual realist system. This is not simply a prasanga distinction -- this is a universal mahdyamaka charge against the treatises of yogacara.

N

gad rgyangs said:

"transforms into wisdom" or "is revealed as wisdom"?

Malcolm wrote:

Transforms.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

conebeckham said:

Some "Yogacaras" don't posit that Mind ultimately exists, I should point out. Or, so say some Tibetan commentators. The standard objection of some Tibetan "Prasangika Madhyamika adherents" often ignores this....

Malcolm wrote:

What they propose is that a mind freed from subject object transforms into wisdom, and if this wisdom does not really exist, liberation is impossible. In order for this wisdom to exist, then the mind out of which wisdom is transformed necessarily must exist. Yogacara thus becomes a non-dual realist system. This is not simply a prasanga distinction -- this is a universal mahdyamaka charge against the treatises of yogacara.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

dakini_boi said:

How do you log on to a closed webcast? Go to the normal webcast site? Anything special you have to do?

Malcolm wrote:

Use your webcast team assigned user name and password on the login page which is found on the files page

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Technology is only one part of the equation. Without addressing the other two we will just rip through whatever savings we may find through more efficient technologies.

Malcolm wrote:

Then there is the Jevons Paradox:

In 1865, the English economist William Stanley Jevons observed that technological improvements that increased the efficiency of coal-use led to the increased consumption of coal in a wide range of industries. He argued that, contrary to common intuition, technological improvements could not be relied upon to reduce fuel consumption.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jevons_paradox " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

This led to a reexamination and restatement as the Khazzoom-Brookes postulate:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khazzoom-Brookes_postulate " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

"When individuals change behavior and begin to use methods and devices that are more energy efficient, there are cases where, on a macro-economic level, energy usage actually increases." The effect of higher energy prices, either through taxes or producer-induced shortages, initially reduces demand but in the longer term encourages greater energy efficiency. This efficiency response amounts to a partial accommodation of the price rise and thus the reduction in demand is blunted. The end result is a new balance between supply and demand at a higher level of supply and consumption than if there had been no efficiency response.

<http://www-dse.ec.unipi.it/persona/docenti/luzzati/italiano/didattica/herringefficiency.pdf> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Dependent origination Vs Interdependent

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

If the seed exists in the sprout then it is not a cause it is an effect. Something cannot be a cause and an effect simultaneously.

If the sprout arises from the seed then the sprout exists as the seed. Something cannot be an effect and a cause at the same time.

If the seed exists independently of the sprout or the sprout exists independently of the seed then we fall into eternalism as we have uncaused effects.

If neither the seed nor the sprout exist we fall into nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:

Nagarjuna says about this, and repeated by Candrakirti in the Prasannapāda is that causes and effects are neither the same nor are they different, using the example of milk and butter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

By the way, the concept of particle only valid for Vaibhasika and Sautrantika.

Cittamantra already reject particle. Cittamantra itself is rejected further by Madyamika.

Cittamantra say everything is mind, and the existence of mind is rejected by Madyamika.

Malcolm wrote:

Some Madhyamakas, such as Bhaviveka and Candrakirti, accepted the model of relative truth proposed by the Sautrantikas, but rejected that of Yogacara. Others, such as Santarakṣita, accepted the relative truth proposed by Yogacara but rejected Yogacara presentations of the ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Sherlock said:

The wang will be given through the webcast too?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, a so called don dbang, a meaning empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Aemilius said:

Actually romans did have machines, here is a picture of a roman sawmill, as an example:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:R%C3%B6mische_S%C3%A4gem%C3%BChle.svg

Namdrol said:

Yes, run by slaves. The cotton gin was also a machine, albeit run by slaves.

Aemilius said:

The roman saw mill uses the power of gravity, ie the flowing of water to a lower level, as in a normal waterpowered electricity generator.

Malcolm wrote:

Manned by slaves again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Conventional & Ultimate Truth

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Partless particle is absurd.

Partless means no part.

Malcolm wrote:

Partless particles are a Sautranika tenet, not a tenet of Bhavaviveka.

Partless particle have no sides i.e. no top bottom, east, west, etc. They do not adhere to one another as in the building block idea of atoms of the Vaibhaṣika school that have sides, etc., which form matter by adhering to the sides of each other.

This is all basic Abhidharma, and do not really have much to do with Mahdyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

Namdrol said:

No that, in his lingo, is self-perfected.

Pero said:

Yeah but I think sometimes he says infinite potentiality (not primordial, my mistake).

You know like when he's saying not only emptiness (ka dag) but also infinite potentiality.

Couldn't we say that lhun grub is the potential for manifestation and thugs rje is the way this potential manifests (as either dang, rolpa or tsal)?

Malcolm wrote:

We talk about three wisdoms, but really, these three are aspects of a single state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 1st, 2012 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

Namdrol said:

It's a meaning gloss. On the other hand, "energy" does not fully express thebīrmanakāya activity of benefitting sentient beings, of which it is the base (hence the reason the wisdom of the basis is described as thug rjes or karuna). So I prefer to translate it as compassion, save energy for "rtsal". "Energy", in my opinion is too vague since it does necessarily included the fact that nirmanakāyas manifest to guide sentient beings.

Someone who understands Dzogchen teachings will then understand the unpacked meaning of thugs rje with the seen the three wisdoms described. ChNN these days tends to translate it as "primordial potentiality". No matter what, when ever it is explained, you always have to mention that it literally means "compassion".

Pero said:

Hmmm I thought primordial/infinite potentiality was lhun grub.

Malcolm wrote:

No that, in his lingo, is self-perfected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Wouldn't it be necessary, to actually have formally have asked a teacher to be your root guru before it is so. I mean, that there is a formal and conscious relationship between the teacher and the student. I wouldn't want to break heavy samaya by slandering or having wrong views about my root guru without actually consciously knowing he is my root guru.

Malcolm wrote:

Whenever a guru gives a major empowerment or direct introduction, there is always a possibility that one or more students will have an authentic discovery of their true state. He already accepts that some students their may discover their real nature, and that they might come to regard him or her as their root guru. That is what it means to take responsibility for giving transmission. When someone gives transmission they are doing so in order to help people become realized, to realized their own nature. When that

happens, that guru becomes the root guru for that student, and from then on that student has real knowledge of their own nature. The person who removes that doubt for you is your root guru and no other. It also does not mean you realize that right away. Sometimes it may take you a little while to figure out. So there is never any need to ask formal permission from some Lama "Oh, can I consider you my root teacher"-- if they say yes, than what shall you do? If you do this, it means you do not have real knowledge of your state or that you have some doubts or are in a state of confusion. Especially if the request is based on just some sort of love-sick emotion that poses as faith (which happens a lot, and why unstable western students often leave this or that lama when the infatuation wears off). The identity of your root guru is based on your own knowledge. No one can tell you who your root guru is, not even some Lama who is acting as a guru. If some Lama declares to you "I am your root guru" before you have some real knowledge of the teachings, then be careful, especially if you have never received some sort of empowerment or direct introduction from that person. If you take a major empowerment from some guru, as I have said, according to the system of Sakya, etc., this person already is your root guru. In this system, one can therefore have as many root gurus as one has received major empowerments. Receiving the four empowerments automatically makes them your root guru. If you received sixteen major empowerments from sixteen different gurus you have sixteen root gurus. According to this system, however, there is also the concept of the karmic link root guru which resembles the Kagyu and Nyingma approach i.e. based on this guru's instructions you have an authentic realization of the nature of your mind. So, if you are approaching this from a Kagyu and Dzogchen point of view, and you do not have real confidence in your state, then you don't have to consider anyone your root guru. Of course you still have gurus -- but when you have real conviction and knowledge then those people who have given you that conviction and knowledge are your actual root gurus. Before that time, they are just your gurus."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Wouldn't it be necessary, to actually have formally have asked a teacher to be your root guru before it is so. I mean, that there is a formal and conscious relationship between the teacher and the student. I wouldn't want to break heavy samaya by slandering or having wrong views about my root guru without actually consciously knowing he is my root guru.

Malcolm wrote:

Whenever a guru gives a major empowerment or direct introduction, there is always a possibility that one or more students will have an authentic discovery of their true state. He already accepts that some students their may discover their real nature, and that they might come to regard him or her as their root guru. That is what it means to take

responsibility for giving transmission. When someone gives transmission they are doing so in order to help people become realized, to realized their own nature. When that happens, that guru becomes the root guru for that student, and from then on that student has real knowledge of their own nature. The person who removes that doubt for you is your root guru and no other. It also does not mean you realize that right away. Sometimes it may take you a little while to figure out. So there is never any need to ask formal permission from some Lama "Oh, can I consider you my root teacher"-- if they say yes, than what shall you do? If you do this, it means you do not have real knowledge of your state or that you have some doubts or are in a state of confusion. Especially if the request is based on just some sort of love-sick emotion that poses as faith (which happens a lot, and why unstable western students often leave this or that lama when the infatuation wears off). The identity of your root guru is based on your own knowledge. No one can tell you who your root guru is, not even some Lama who is acting as a guru. If some Lama declares to you "I am your root guru" before you have some real knowledge of the teachings, then be careful, especially if you have never received some sort of empowerment or direct introduction from that person. If you take a major empowerment from some guru, as I have said, according to the system of Sakya, etc., this person already is your root guru. In this system, one can therefore have as many root gurus as one has received major empowerments. Receiving the four empowerments automatically makes them your root guru. If you received sixteen major empowerments from sixteen different gurus you have sixteen root gurus. According to this system, however, there is also the concept of the karmic link root guru which resembles the Kagyu and Nyingma approach i.e. based on this guru's instructions you have an authentic realization of the nature of your mind. So, if you are approaching this from a Kagyu and Dzogchen point of view, and you do not have real confidence in your state, then you don't have to consider anyone your root guru. Of course you still have gurus -- but when you have real conviction and knowledge then those people who have given you that conviction and knowledge are your actual root gurus. Before that time, they are just your gurus."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

Namdrol said:

According to the traditions of Sakya, Gelug and Jonang, a root guru is anyone from whom one has received the four empowerments.

In Kagyu, a root guru is someone who actually caused you to recognize the nature of your mind in a non-intellectual way.

In Dzogchen, a root guru is the person who introduces one to one's primordial state in an unmistakable way.

Clarence said:

N-la,

Is there a difference between what is shown in Kagyu and Dzogchen or do they both show the same thing, only the way to get there is different?

Best, C

Malcolm wrote:

You will probably get different answers, but the former is included in the latter, so there is some similarity of meaning. The terminology is very different however, and there are key differences between the two presentations that depend on their respective paths.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

Namdrol said:

According to the traditions of Sakya, Gelug and Jonang, a root guru is anyone from whom one has received the four empowerments.

In Kagyu, a root guru is someone who actually caused you to recognize the nature of your mind in a non-intellectual way.

In Dzogchen, a root guru is the person who introduces one to one's primordial state in an unmistakable way.

Clarence said:

N-la,

Is there a difference between what is shown in Kagyu and Dzogchen or do they both show the same thing, only the way to get there is different?

Best, C

Malcolm wrote:

You will probably get different answers, but the former is included in the latter, so there is some similarity of meaning. The terminology is very different however, and there are key differences between the two presentations that depend on their respective paths.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

Totoro said:

In another post Gregkarvanos said:

A teacher is one thing, but a root guru is a completely different deal!

When does a teacher become a root guru? Say, if a teacher decides to spend a couple of years or so to check out a disciple and vice versa, before 'accepting' him as a serious student, what will happen to change that status to 'root guru'? Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the traditions of Sakya, Gelug and Jonang, a root guru is anyone from whom one has received the four empowerments.

In Kagyu, a root guru is someone who actually caused you to recognize the nature of your mind in a non-intellectual way.

In Dzogchen, a root guru is the person who introduces one to one's primordial state in an unmistakable way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Teacher & Root Guru

Content:

Totoro said:

In another post Gregkarvanos said:

A teacher is one thing, but a root guru is a completely different deal!

When does a teacher become a root guru? Say, if a teacher decides to spend a couple of years or so to check out a disciple and vice versa, before 'accepting' him as a serious student, what will happen to change that status to 'root guru'? Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the traditions of Sakya, Gelug and Jonang, a root guru is anyone from whom one has received the four empowerments.

In Kagyu, a root guru is someone who actually caused you to recognize the nature of your mind in a non-intellectual way.

In Dzogchen, a root guru is the person who introduces one to one's primordial state in an unmistakable way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Chod vs Mahamudra Chod

Content:

twonny said:

As far as I know there is no such think as Dzogchen or Mahamudra chod

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there are. Jigme Lingpa's chö is an example of Chö from the Dzogchen tradition.

Troma Nagmo from Dudjom Tersar is another. These chö practices are marked by using termonology from the system of Dzogchen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Aemilius said:

Actually romans did have machines, here is a picture of a roman sawmill, as an example:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:R%C3%B6mische_S%C3%A4gem%C3%BChle.svg

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, run by slaves. The cotton gin was also a machine, albeit run by slaves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thugs rje rig pa'i ye shes su bzhugs pas mkhyen pa'i cha ma 'gag par so sor gsal kyang
bya ba dang byed pa'i rnam pa yul yul can du snang ba ni med do/

Namdrol said:

Though the knowing part manifests individually without ceasing [mkhyen pa'i cha ma 'gag par so sor gsal kyang] since compassion is present as the wisdom of vidyā [thugs rje rig pa'i ye shes su bzhugs pas], the aspect of action and agent [bya ba dang byed pa'i rnam] appearing as [du snang ba] an object and a subject [yul yul can] does not exist.

gad rgyangs said:

thanks, this is awesome! first, i'm wondering how the published version translated "rig pa'i ye shes" as "intrinsic awareness (rig pa) of pristine wisdom (ye shes)", it seems backwards to me, or doesn't it really matter?

Malcolm wrote:

It matters. It is a genetive constuction. Also intrinsic awareness in an inappropriate gloss. Pristine is a little weird because it is usage that dates from 16th century which is not generally current. These days pristine means "new or fresh", generally not "original, former, primitive and undeveloped", unless we are talking about old growth forests and wilderness as in "pristine wilderness". Ye nas "has always" is a synonym of rtag tu, "will always, permanently", etc., and as a clause in Tibetan functions the same way.

gad rgyangs said:

I've been thinking about "energy" as the translation of thugs rje...

Malcolm wrote:

It's a meaning gloss. On the other hand, "energy" does not fully express theb nirmanakāya activity of benefitting sentient beings, of which it is the base (hence the reason the wisdom of the basis is described as thug rjes or karuna). So I prefer to translate it as compassion, save energy for "rtsal". "Energy", in my opinion is too vague since it does necessarily included the fact that nirmanakāyas manifest to guide sentient beings.

Someone who understands Dzogchen teachings will then understand the unpacked meaning of thugs rje with the seen the three wisdoms described. ChNN these days tends to translate it as "primordial potentiality". No matter what, when ever it is explained, you always have to mention that it literally means "compassion".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

arsent said:

It seems to me it will be an open webcast..

Malcolm wrote:

It isn't

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 6:56 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thugs rje rig pa'i ye shes su bzhugs pas mkhyen pa'i cha ma 'gag par so sor gsal kyang
bya ba dang byed pa'i rnam pa yul yul can du snang ba ni med do/

Malcolm wrote:

Though the knowing part manifests individually without ceasing [mkhyen pa'i cha ma 'gag par so sor gsal kyang] since compassion is present as the wisdom of vidyā [thugs rje rig pa'i ye shes su bzhugs pas], the aspect of action and agent [bya ba dang byed pa'i rnam] appearing as [du snang ba] an object and a subject [yul yul can] does not exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

Thanks for the clarification, Namdrol. I'm sure I would practice incorrectly, but maybe it's something I could do on my deathbed.

Malcolm wrote:

It is best to have such a teaching so it can be practiced when needed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if sentient beings and buddhas are the basis' awareness, what the basis' awareness manifests as, then it is not necessary to posit an aware entity that is dangerously close to being a deity. the basis sleeps in its bardo, and its awareness (us) is withdrawn. it wakes, and we manifest.

Namdrol said:

This is basically how it is -- but since there is no individuating consciousnesses driven by affliction, the awareness latent in the basis is not discussed in plural terms, that is until there are individuating consciousnesses when samasara and nirvana "turn their back to each other".

gad rgyangs said:

ok. now: next problem. what the heck is this cyclic thingy of the basis, its "sleeping" phase, with latent awareness, and its manifest phase? first of all, this is temporal, and certainly anything that is beyond concepts of existence or non-existence is going to be way beyond temporality. so, the basis cannot actually have a cycle, its tsal maybe does whatever it wants, including cycles, but not the basis itself.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, this comes about because of traces of action and ignorance. Nothing in the basis

changes, of course, what happens is that there is sort of cosmic pulsation of ignorance and its subsidence which results in the appearance and disappearance of samsara and nirvana; and as we know, traces can accumulate in wisdom.

You have to understand that all of this explanation of cosmic cycles is really intended to be brought down to the level of the individual's life cycle in terms of the four bardos:

The bardo of death == destruction of the universe up to the two higher form realms

The bardo of dharmatā == the arising of the sound, light and rays of the basis

The bardo of becoming == non-recognition of the basis

The natural bardo of this life == the appearance of samsara and nirvana

It is an explanation for practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

padma norbu said:

heehee, I should do this retreat just so you can all see just how bad the results can be... but, seriously, thanks again for the info. Will steer clear of this one for sure.

asunthatneversets said:

Why steer clear? It's not often opportunities like this come up, even if you receive the wang, lung and tri and don't do the practice at this point in time it's still good to receive the teaching... you may change your mind in the future and then you're already locked and loaded. Not everyone has access to teachings like this, or teachers like ChNN, you have the opportunity, I'd say take advantage of it. Authentic teachers are few and far between and life is delicate and can be lost at any moment, now is the time!

padma norbu said:

Uh... I don't need any more obstacles and I'm crazy enough already. Based on what Namdrol has said here, at least I have enough sense to avoid this teaching. I'm just thankful for the knowledge and wanted to express my thanks. I've received other teachings without knowledge of what it fully entails and didn't appreciate it too much. I would be furious if I learned this practice can create obstacles or madness after the fact, when my life seems to be going even more haywire than it already is.

Malcolm wrote:

Receiving the teaching does not cause problems -- practicing it incorrectly does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 31st, 2012 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if sentient beings and buddhas are the basis' awareness, what the basis' awareness manifests as, then it is not necessary to posit an aware entity that is dangerously close to being a deity. the basis sleeps in its bardo, and its awareness (us) is withdrawn. it wakes, and we manifest.

Malcolm wrote:

This is basically how it is -- but since there is no individuating consciousnesses driven by affliction, the awareness latent in the basis is not discussed in plural terms, that is until there are individuating consciousnesses when samasara and nirvana "turn their back to each other".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Adumbra said:

There is really no strong refutation of theism once you trade in the idea of a good and perfect creator for one who is, at best, amoral and capable of error such as the demiurgos of Plato's conception.

gregkavarnos said:

Of course there is, Dependent Origination, yah know???

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you, Greg.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Peak Oil

Content:

Aemilius said:

They didn't have machines, that's true, but they had some form of mass production of tiles. It is justified when historians have said that certain emperors owned tile factories.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, millions of slaves.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:18 PM
Title: Re: Understanding The Basis
Content:

Namdrol said:
The basis is the three kāyas. The three kāyas are free from thought, but the basis is not a mere inert void.

gad rgyangs said:
2 questions:

1. is the basis aware in any way, or are we sentient beings and not-quite-perfect-buddhas the only manifestations of sentience?

Malcolm wrote:
Define what you mean by "aware".

gad rgyangs said:
2. can we agree (in the interests of communication) that rang byung ye shes (self arisen wisdom) usually pertains to the base, is in fact a synonym for the base, and rigpa is the manifestation of that ye shes in/as a sentient being?

Malcolm wrote:
Rigpa is one's knowledge of the basis and that is all. Rigpa is not the basis.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:08 PM
Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat
Content:

michaelb said:
I know. I attended some teachings in London a couple of years ago, and have watched quite a few open webcasts, and met up with local members for the transmission. but joining just for one closed webcast when i really want teachings on another terma may not be the best reason to join.

Malcolm wrote:
It could be a perfect reason to join.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Clarence said:

Having everything decentralized just doesn't work efficiently in this case.

Malcolm wrote:

It is mostly an issue of differences in international law.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 8:54 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so its more like the basis is a container for this aggregate of latent awarenesses, rather than it being the awareness of the basis itself?

Namdrol said:

It is part of the rtsal of the basis.

The basis is not one thing, it is not many. It is the dharmadhātu.

N

gad rgyangs said:

so sentient beings and buddhas are part of the tsal of the basis, but the basis itself has no awareness, since during the bardo phase, the latent awarenesses in the basis are really the dormant sentient beings and non-'samyak sambuddha' buddhas? where are the samyak sambuddhas then, if the basis is the dharmakaya, they must be there too? i mean, there's no "larger context" within which the basis is found, no "where" outside the basis where the samyak sambuddhas would be?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is the three kāyas. The three kāyas are free from thought, but the basis is not a mere inert void.

There is no larger context and you know better than to ask one of the fourteen questions Buddha refused to answer (i.e. where do tathagatas go after death).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Understanding The Basis

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so its more like the basis is a container for this aggregate of latent awarenesses, rather than it being the awareness of the basis itself?

Malcolm wrote:

It is part of the rtsal of the basis.

The basis is not one thing, it is not many. It is the dharmadhātu.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so what becomes of the latent awareness of the basis? are we it?

Malcolm wrote:

When the latent awareness (shes pa bag la nyal] of the basis recognizes the basis as its own display, it becomes prajñā [shes rab] and realizes buddhahood as Samantabhadra.

When the latent awareness of the basis does not recognize itself, under the power of the imputing ignorance that imputs appearances as other and that awareness as a self, it becomes consciousness [rnam par shes pa].

The 'latent awareness of the basis' is an aggregate name for all those beings who have not achieved total buddhahood in the previous eon, but achieved a so called "buddhahood that reverts to the cause", [as I have explained now several times within the last few weeks] in the same way that we refer to the aggregated consciousnesses of all sentient beings as the vijñānadhātu, along with dhātus of earth, water, air, fire and space, the so called sadadhātu, the six dhātus.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Fruitzilla said:

Call me Fruity if you like, but I then start wondering why Nagarjuna is so highly valued in

Mahayana circles, and his work explained on such a broad basis, instead of the narrow one for which it seems it was initially meant.

It does make good sense to me in the narrow way, and it explains why in the broad way it often feels like missing the mark.

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

Most of Nagarjuna's works are critical, but they are based in Mahāyāna sūtra perspectives, specifically, the prajñāpāramitā sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

My smart phone knows my name.

Malcolm wrote:

So it is a "knowing knower?"

Related to your other comment, there are instances where Nagarjuna's refutations are completely irrelevant in the modern context, and instances where they are relevant and very much so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Apparently not in Dzogchen, since during this phase, there are neither buddhas nor sentient beings, no samsara, no nirvana. This the reason why the basis is also called "the bardo of samsara and nirvana", meaning that neither are manifest during this period.

gad rgyangs said:

hang on: the basis isn't only during the bardo. what about the basis right now?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is called the basis because it has not been realized.

At present the basis is not latent, like it is between eons. At present the basis is in a

state of manifestation as Buddhas and sentient beings. When the basis is latent, we term it "the time of the basis" or "the bardo of samsara and nirvana". After the basis manifests we term this phase "samsara and nirvana turn their backs to one another". When we

When we fully realize the path of dzogchen, it is called "the universe manifests as the basis": in other words, our total experience will be the three wisdoms subsumed under the name, great original purity.

The basis itself has not changed in anyway during these three time periods.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i was thinking of the general sense of knowing awareness, more specifically self-awareness. in the sense of rigpa maybe? im just interested in the idea that if the basis is not conscious, so where does consciousness in general, and rigpa specifically, come from?

Namdrol said:

The basis possesses a neutral or latent awareness [shes pa lung ma bstan or shes pa bag la nyal] which is unaware of itself. But this is only a very general way of speaking, just as we speak of the six dhātus: earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness.

gad rgyangs said:

isnt awareness (of any kind) a characteristic of a sentient being, indeed the definition of a sentient being?

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not in Dzogchen, since during this phase, there are neither buddhas nor sentient beings, no samsara, no nirvana. This the reason why the basis is also called "the bardo of samsara and nirvana", meaning that neither are manifest during this period.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i was thinking of the general sense of knowing awareness, more specifically self-awareness. in the sense of rigpa maybe? im just interested in the idea that if the basis is not conscious, so where does consciousness in general, and rigpa specifically, come from?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis possesses a neutral or latent awareness [shes pa lung ma bstan or shes pa bag la nyal] which is unaware of itself. But this is only a very general way of speaking, just as we speak of the six dhātus: earth, water, fire, air, space and consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Thugs rjes (karuna) is the word used to describe the nirmanakāya function of the basis. As long as we understand that is what compassion means, we do not need a better word than compassion to describe this aspect of the basis.

N

gad rgyangs said:

so on what level does cognizance make its appearance: dharmakaya, sambhogakaya, or nirmanakaya?

Malcolm wrote:

What is the Tibetan word for you are using "cognizance"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

then the basis is just a metaphor (fine with me).

Namdrol said:

Well, no -- compassion is the basis for the expression of the nirmanakāya and its activities.

gad rgyangs said:

maybe "compassion" and "responsiveness" are not good translations then, since they

are so clearly agentive. Rinpoche in Crystal +Way of Light seems to be translating thugs rje as "energy"

Malcolm wrote:

Thugs rjes (karuna) is the word used to describe the nirmanakāya function of the basis. As long as we understand that is what compassion means, we do not need a better word than compassion to describe this aspect of the basis.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 30th, 2012 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Ok I understand now, but it raises the question what are we seeking liberation from and how does a Bodhisattva save all sentient beings

Malcolm wrote:

We are seeking liberation from beginningless samsara; and bodhisattvas do not save all sentient beings, they merely wish to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 29th, 2012 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

where did these previous beings from the previous universe come from? it just goes around in circles and would only work if there were a finite amount of beings

Malcolm wrote:

From the universe prior to that ad infinitum. The logic of dependent origination does not permit of any sort of beginnings whatsoever. No first causes, no first moment, no first universe, etc. There are an infinite number of sentient beings who also have no beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 29th, 2012 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

AdmiraUim said:

Design means to draw or create deliberately according to some plan -- but instead the universe arose because the blind force of the collective actions of ignorant sentient beings [from a previous universe]/quote

where did these previous beings come from?

Malcolm wrote:

The previous universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 29th, 2012 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

You caught my sense Tom, it was about the ball, MMK CH2:1 is about the rolling.

Malcolm wrote:

MMK refutes moving movers, such as rolling balls. The minute you suggest that balls roll, then automatically the subroutine that refutes rolling rollers kicks in.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 29th, 2012 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

Yes, persons and aggregates exist conventionally.

We can reject the alaya as a non-existent by carefully reading Chandrakirti.

Malcolm wrote:

So in other words, you admit that it is not explicitly obvious that Candrakirti rejects ālaya conventionally, and this rejection must be based on a "careful" reading of the MAV.

cloudburst said:

In the MAV verse you cite above, he says that although things are natureless, he taught that they exist. This can only mean that although things are natureless, he taught that they exist by nature, because otherwise he wouldn't have set up natureless and existence as opposites and used the word "though." So Buddha taught that the alaya, persons, aggregates, etc exist inherently or by nature whereas they do not.

Malcolm wrote:

Here is Candra's statment commenting on 6:46:

"Now then, if it is said that ālayavijñāna is something which is said in the Ārya Lankāvatara and so on to be the basis [possessing a special power of limitless phenomena] of all seeds which are the cause of the arising of all things, like waves and an ocean. Does that not exist as arising in any way at all?"

Such is not the case, but that was demonstrated as stated because it is demonstrated as existing to those to be disciplined. In order to introduce the nature [svabhāva] of all things, only emptiness is demonstrated by the word ālayajñāna."

If you read this passage alone, you will come away with the idea that Candrakīrti is basically saying there is no ālaya. But...

Jayananda's expansion of this passage is interesting, and I think it is likely a source of disagreement among Tibetan scholars on this point because of a) how he qualifies Candrakīrti's discussion b) because his is the only Indian commentary we possess after Candrakīrti's bhasya of MAV. I have parsed out the passage for clarity and have spent some time doing so today since I don't know that anyone has actually looked at this before (maybe, perhaps in some journal somewhere).

That 'suppose' is for demonstrating the argument of the cittamātrins, it is said "Supposing in that way...". When 'presented in connection with the result of actions', though the ālayajñāna does not exist, since the actions lack a nature, the conclusion of a perished action is presented as the production of the the result of action in the relative [samvṛtti].

The 'basis which has a special power of limitless phenomena' means a consciousness of the appearance of infinite phenomena such as blue, yellow, and so on. The power of those means the traces (vāsanā). For example, like the scent arising from approaching a flower, in that same way, the consciousness of blue and so on perfume the ālayajñāna; it is the basis or support of the traces. Therefore, this is the significance of saying it is the cause of all the seeds (bījas) i.e. consciousnesses.

Now in order to demonstrate the example, waves and so on are mentioned.

'The cause of the arising all things' means because it is the cause of giving rise to the consciousness of the appearances of blue and so on.

"Ārya Lankāvatara and so on..." says
The ālayajñāna is deep and subtle,
like a flowing river upon which all the seeds fall,
I do not teach this to the immature
since they will imagine they should impute a self.
'Does that not exist in anyway?' means 'has it never existed'?

Now then, in order to respond to the question, it is said 'Such is not the case...' and so on.

'Such is not the case' means 'it is not non-existent', but on the other hand, 'it was taught as existent for a purpose by the Bhagavan.'

'That was demonstrated as stated because it is demonstrated as existing to those to be disciplined' means 'Since the ālayajñāna was demonstrated as existent, the ālayajñāna was demonstrated as existent to those persons who were to be disciplined'.

Ultimately [don dam], because the 'ālayavijñāna' is demonstrated as being an description of only emptiness, it is said '...the nature of all things' and so on.

For what reason is it said 'In order to introduce the nature of all things'? It is for introducing the the emptiness of things with "Not from self, not from other..." i.e. only emptiness is the ālaya, but because of the consciousness of that [emptiness] itself [de nyid] i.e. because of the perfect comprehension of that is free from perception of all phenomena [chos thams cad mi dmigs pa], therefore, emptiness itself is demonstrated by the term ālayavijñāna."

I submit therefore that this passage opens up a very different way of looking the Candrakirtian treatment of the ālayavijñāna. Since we ought to accept that Jayānanda possessed the oral lineage of interpreting this text, I think we can safely say that this passage means we really ought to carefully rethink whether Candrakirti so thoroughly rejects ālayavijñāna as some Tibetan Madhyamaka scholars seem to think he does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

in the Dzogchen view, the characteristics of the basis are purity (kadag, emptiness), inexhaustible and uninterrupted manifestation (lhundrup) and responsiveness/compassion (thugje). now, can there be compassion and responsiveness as an impersonal phenomena? I don't see how, since it is by definition intentional, and intentionality is a characteristic of consciousness, of awareness.

Namdrol said:

Gems are inert, so they have no intention. Whoever possesses that gem can get what they want.

Likewise, compassion has no intentionlity, but since everyone posssess that basis, liberation is possible for all sentient beings.

gad rgyangs said:

then the basis is just a metaphor (fine with me).

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no -- compassion is the basis for the expression of the nirmanakāya and its activities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Candrakirti and the ālaya

Content:

cloudburst said:

Did Gorampa accept that the Alaya as a consciousness was non-existent like the hair on a bald man's head? If not we DO disagree there which as the original point.

Malcolm wrote:

Candra says: in MAV 6:43-44 (my translation):

"The ālaya exists', 'the person exists',
'only these aggregates exist',
these teachings are for those who
cannot understand the profound dharma.
Just as the Buddha taught 'I' and 'mine',
though free from the view of a self [satkāyadṛiṣṭi];
likewise, though indeed things are natureless,
'existence' is demonstrated as the provisional meaning [neyartha].

The first question I have for you is: do persons and aggregates exist conventionally, and if they do, upon what basis are we then to reject the ālaya as being the son of a barren women, if we on the other hand admit that persons and aggregates are the sons of fertile women?

The second question I have for you is: what in your view, is the difference between the provisional meaning and conventional truth?

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Fa Dao said:

Rinpoche has given the Medicine Buddha transmission numerous times. Is there a specific DC practice for this or can it be done in Anuyoga style? Also I have heard the mantra done a couple of different ways, how does Rinpoche teach it?

Malcolm wrote:

There are two -- Orgyen Menlha and the Medicine Buddha from Namcho. I am not sure where you can get them, but I think if you send an email to the secretary of DCA, he can help you further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Tom said:

The reason for which is the lack of existence of motion in any of the three times. It just seemed your previous statement could be read as drawing an ontological distinction between moved objects and moving objects.

Namdrol said:

There is no basis for saying that something is moving, apart from something which has not moved or has moved. If you are familiar with the argument rejecting motion in the MMK than all of this is old hat.

Tom said:

I don't disagree, you are basically just quoting MMK CH2:1, my point is just that this verse is about the rolling not the ball.

Although, I do understand that motion and movement exist interdependently. Without motion there is no mover and without a mover there is no motion and that this precludes existing either independently or inherently.

Malcolm wrote:

I was responding to this: "a basketball rolling across the floor."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Tom said:

The reason for which is the lack of existence of motion in any of the three times. It just seemed your previous statement could be read as drawing an ontological distinction between moved objects and moving objects.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no basis for saying that something is moving, apart from something which has not moved or has moved. If you are familiar with the argument rejecting motion in the MMK than all of this is old hat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

If something like this worked, it might be easier to understand Nagarjuna's fivefold reasoning applied to, say, a basketball rolling across the floor.

Namdrol said:

No, Nāgārjuna would say something much simpler:

"Apart from a ball which has rolled and a ball which has not rolled, there no ball rolling."

CF his negation of movement.

Tom said:

Isn't it problematic to posit a rolled ball and a not rolled ball and then refute the rolling ball? They all exist in the same way, by way of conception.

What is refuted is that there is rolling in the past, rolling in the future, or rolling in the present (which is an instant).

Malcolm wrote:

The subject of the analysis in MMK is "I am going to town". "The ball is rolling" is the same sort of statment, treated the same way.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

If something like this worked, it might be easier to understand Nagarjuna's fivefold reasoning applied to, say, a basketball rolling across the floor.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Nāgārjuna would say something much simpler:

"Apart from a ball which has rolled and a ball which has not rolled, there no ball rolling."

CF his negation of movement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Fatigue in high humidity climates.

Content:

Huseng said:

Question for Namdrol.

I've noticed that in high humidity climates my strength drains away and I suffer fatigue. I can't sleep enough and feel tired until at least around 10am/11am.

I don't seem to have this problem in low humidity climates like in Ladakh or Canada, or even around Bihar when I was there in February. But in summertime Japan and during the rainy season there, as well as here in Taiwan where the humidity is always high, I suffer fatigue. Getting up at 6am is a hard struggle. Though in low humidity zones this isn't an issue for me.

Any suggestions?

Malcolm wrote:

The best thing I can suggest is to try sleeping on an outside veranda with screening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 28th, 2012 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Namdrol said:

How about "suffering cannot be removed with the hand..."

Sherab said:

No source of the citation was provided.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a citation produced in a thousand Tibetan texts. My example was found in a text on Madhyamaka called Moonrays penned by Rongton Shebya Kunrig.

I have tried text searches on the bka' 'gyur and bstan 'gyur to no avail. If it exists there, it does not exist in the common translation one sees in a thousand tibetan books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

look at me go! I would say we can both spit out a basic presentation of how madhyamaka works. Did Gorampa accept that the Alaya as a consciousness was non-existent like the hair on a bald man's head? If not we DO disagree there which as the original point.

Malcolm wrote:

I think the question you are asking is "Does Gorampa accept that idea that Candrakirti thinks the ālaya as a consciousness is like the hair on a bald man's head."

As I stated before, I think that Gorampa thinks that Candrakirti's view on the conventional existence or non-existence of the ālayavijñāna is more nuanced and subtle than what some other scholars are willing to allow and that he disagrees with how some other scholars present Candrakirti's refutation of the ālayavijñāna, and so on, for reasons that are complex.

I have no idea whether Gorampa is correct or incorrect because Candrakirti is not around to be questioned. My suggestion is that one should examine the Bhasya and Jayānanda's commentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

I am not discussing my own POV.

cloudburst said:

Whose POV are you discussing?

In this particular exchange, I am discussing what gorampa has to say, and because what Gorampa has to say is a little complicated about a very specific point, I was teasing out the threads so it would be easier to understand.

As far as learning Tibetan goes, it is my observation that people get led very far afield because they become attached to certain English phrases which are not very precise renditions of Sanskrit and Tibetan terms, or in the case of Khenpo Karl, rather novel attempts at accuracy which have not gained wide currency. Thus, if they learn Tibetan, they will have more ability to check a given translation in order to better understand it. I must say, that is an excellent point and I accept it and applaud you and second it. I find one of the best ways to question this is to debate it, honestly.

Malcolm wrote:

It might help you, then, to debate with someone who is more highly trained than myself, or the average run of the mill internet user. For example, let us say you defeat in debate someone who is inarticulate at expressing Tsongkhapa's view -- have you defeated

Tsongkhapa's view? No.

I really hesitate to boldly state: "This scholar is wrong, this scholar is right". The reason I continually encourage people to go back to the basic Indian texts is that, quite frankly, Tibetan scholarship on these issues extremely complex.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

Gorampa is saying that conventional things possess internal contradictions — this fact [that they possess internal contradictions] is what allows them to be refuted ultimately. He is not saying that these internal contradictions are what appear prior to analysis.

cloudburst said:

Though I fear to give you further feelings of futility and despair, I cannot agree with Gorampa. If you must think it is for sectarian reasons so be it. I think that whatever internal contradictions they appear to have are resolved at the conventional level. Contradictions may appear, but these contradictions only arise when you fail to be satisfied with valid appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

You just agreed with Gorampa. Gorampa said contradictions exist within conventionalities which do not appear until analysis. All analysis appears at the conventional level. No one is disputing that; but all analysis has one aim, at least in Madhyamaka, to discern the real state of a given event or thing, such as a self-cognizing mind or a self-illuminating lamp, and so on.

cloudburst said:

Does a lamp dispel darkness? Yup. Does an orange seed give rise to an orange tree? Yup. If you begin to analyze these conventions, they will become unstable, but if analyzed, as all the Madhyamaka masters advise, they appear and function in a thoroughly non-contradictory manner.

Malcolm wrote:

You just agreed with Gorampa.

cloudburst said:

in the MMK Nagarjuna's investigation seeks out HOW the darkness is dispelled.... does it meet with the light? But how could it, where the lamp is there is no darkness! etc. This contradiction arises as a result of the beginning of an ultimate search. Conventionally, we can say that the lamp dispels the darkness and there is a conventional reason for that. What about that reason, does it too have a reason? Yes.

and so on until the answer is I don't know why that is, but we know that in fact it is.

Malcolm wrote:

You just agreed with Gorampa. This the sort of hastiness that has lead to centuries of Tibetan trench warfare.

Namdrol said:

I am not saying that Gorampa is better than you, for on this score, indeed he is not.

you are no better than either of us low-down beings who cannot refrain from polemics. Declaim all you like but

Malcolm wrote:

I am trying to show you that such polemics carried out in the way we all have previously carried them out bring no one closer to any real understanding of anything, and in fact merely dig deeper sectarian trenches.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Yantra Yoga - 2 DVDs set

Content:

spanda said:

I addressed this question because I thought that Yantra Yoga can be learned only if I attend retreats with yantra yoga instructors. Now I can learn by myself, using this DVDs, if I have the transmission?

Also: it is possible to replace with this system of yantra, another system of tsa-lung, connected with a tummo practice from another lineage/cycle of teachings?

I can practice this system of yantra yoga with tummo from a different cycle of teachings, with the same efficiency?

Namdrol said:

Sure. why not.

spanda said:

So, we can't say in any way that a specific system of yantra (from kalachakra, or Lamdre, for exemple), is better than this one, for tummo practice?

Malcolm wrote:

The best system is the one you will practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:46 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Because the force of our ignorance is stronger than their power.

spanda said:

Are you serious here? This is not a joke?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am being completely serious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:30 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

spanda said:

Being a bodhisattva on the paths and stages does not mean one has knowledge of methods. It just means one has realized emptiness and is practicing the six perfections.

.

My mistake. Fully enlightened beings. Why they don't coordinate the elements of all the people in sufferings, to make them healthy, if it is possible? There are limitations for them also, here?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the force of our ignorance is stronger than their power.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Yantra Yoga - 2 DVDs set

Content:

spanda said:

I addressed this question because I thought that Yantra Yoga can be learned only if I attend retreats with yantra yoga instructors. Now I can learn by myself, using this DVDs, if I have the transmission?

Also: it is possible to replace with this system of yantra, another system of tsa-lung, connected with a tummo practice from another lineage/cycle of teachings?

I can practice this system of yantra yoga with tummo from a different cycle of teachings, with the same efficiency?

Malcolm wrote:
Sure. why not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

spanda said:

And by the limitation imposed by Namdrol (somehow logical) its' very difficult to explain how this practices work.

Malcolm wrote:

They work because we are all connected through the elements, and the elements are empty.

At the level of Dzogchen they function because of rtsal.

But there are serious limitations on what we can do for someone else.

Being a bodhisattva on the paths and stages does not mean one has knowledge of methods. It just means one has realized emptiness and is practicing the six perfections.

For example, in Tibetan Medicine we discuss the issue of karmic diseases. When someone has a karmic disease there is nothing they can do about it except accumulate merit. They can hire someone do rituals on their behalf, and this is effective because they are causing the action to take place, etc. etc.

When a community of people do a long life practice for teacher for example, as a community they are generating merit, and since the teacher belongs to that community too, also their own merit increases, etc. It is mutually reinforcing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Yantra Yoga - 2 DVDs set

Content:

spanda said:

Detailed instruction on ALL series of Yantra Yoga? If I have learned from an instructor, only the basis of Yantra Yoga (Warm Ups - The Nine Purification Breathings - Tsigjong, Lungsang, Tsadul), I can learn the rest of Yantra yoga (the five series) form this DVDs? It's to nice to be real...

Malcolm wrote:

There are two different sets -- this covers everything up through first series of yantras;

there is another CD which covers the rest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

in the Dzogchen view, the characteristics of the basis are purity (kadag, emptiness), inexhaustible and uninterrupted manifestation (lhundrup) and responsiveness/compassion (thugje). now, can there be compassion and responsiveness as an impersonal phenomena? I don't see how, since it is by definition intentional, and intentionality is a characteristic of consciousness, of awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Gems are inert, so they have no intention. Whoever possesses that gem can get what they want.

Likewise, compassion has no intentionality, but since everyone possesses that basis, liberation is possible for all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Will said:

[

So intelligent design, Yes - Supreme Creator, No.

Malcolm wrote:

Design means to draw or create deliberately according to some plan -- but instead the universe arose because the blind force of the collective actions of ignorant sentient beings [from a previous universe]. So, no intelligence, no design and no creator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:42 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Namdrol said:

The universe, therefore, arose from distant cause of ignorance.

gad rgyangs said:

just as long as this is not interpreted as a mistake, or something that needs to be

"corrected"

Malcolm wrote:

It needs to be corrected so that the universe will arise as the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:41 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Sherab said:

I've also stated that vajrayana practices/customs point to the ability of giving and taking something that has been manifested.

Malcolm wrote:

For example? What practices? Customs are not Dharma. They are customs. For example is was the custom in a part of Eastern Bhutan to slaughter animals for ganapujas until Kunzang Dechen Lingpa put an end to it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:39 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Sherab said:

I've asked for quotations to show that manifested results cannot be remove from a being by another...

Malcolm wrote:

How about "suffering cannot be removed with the hand..."

This is about as clear a citation as you can get.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 8:37 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Namdrol said:

The idea that Buddhas can take on the karma of sentient beings is the worst sort of theistic thinking.

Sherab said:

Assertion like this without providing explanations does not help move a discussion forward to a resolution and is merely an attempt to impose a particular viewpoint. And I think no one here is really referring to the action karma or any latency but to the manifested results.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhas are free from experiencing the ripening of the result of karma [karmavipakaphala], hence it stands to reason they cannot take on the results of karma.

Birth in one of the six lokas is the manifested result of karma. Do you think Buddha can just place one in nirvana?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 7:14 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

As everyone can see

Namdrol said:

Good luck with your studies.

N

Mariusz said:

Sorry, its my english. I did not mean wordly beings but worldly beings, and worldly daily-life consensus.

Malcolm wrote:

worldly daily life consenseus = lokavyavahara = worldly convention, which is what we are discussing. So you just agreed with Gorampa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 7:12 AM

Title: Re: Tibetanmedicine-edu.org 3 year online course

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

Namdrol,

Is the Shang Shung Institute's online Tibetan Medicine school up and running yet? It seems that they said they'd have info by September of last year, but I still don't see anything. I'm planning on applying for the full 4-year program. Do you have any info or

advice?

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty sure that it is.

You ought to contact Dr. Phuntsog Wangmo and find out from her directly.

Best,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

As everyone can see

Malcolm wrote:

Good luck with your studies.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Can someone please post some works of Nagarjuna?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Bocking's Nagarjuna in China is one of the clearest. Full MMK plus commentary closely related to Buddhapālita which clearly identifies positions.

Jnana said:

There's also Akira Saito's doctoral dissertation:

<https://digitalcollections.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/8139>, which includes an English translation of Buddhapālita's commentary and edited Tibetan text.

Malcolm wrote:

Awesome, saves me the task of completing my translation of the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan question

Content:

Jack Dawkins said:

Hi, I'm hoping someone can help on an issue of punctuation. I want to quote the first two lines - but only the first two lines - of the following:

འཁོར་བ་ཐུ་ངན་འདས་པ་ལས།
ཁྱད་པར་ཅུང་ཟད་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན།
ཐུ་ངན་འདས་པ་འཁོར་བ་ལས།
ཁྱད་པར་ཅུང་ཟད་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན།

Can anyone tell me which punctuation marks I should include? If the first two lines are put on a single line (i.e.):

འཁོར་བ་ཐུ་ངན་འདས་པ་ལས།ཁྱད་པར་ཅུང་ཟད་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན།

Do I need to delete one or both of the shads in the middle? Also, do the shads at the beginning and end remain the same?

The text is of course from MMK 25.19

Many thanks,

JD

Malcolm wrote:

It has to look like this:

འཁོར་བ་ཐུ་ངན་འདས་པ་ལས། ཁྱད་པར་ཅུང་ཟད་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན།

You need more space between final shad and the beginning shad.

But if you did it in Sanskrit it would be just one long string i.e. two verses of Tibetan generally = one verse of Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that Buddhas can take on the karma of sentient beings is the worst sort of theistic thinking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

Will said:

Buddha defined karma as intentional or purposive (cetana) action; thus action/karma requires a being or beings. So the universe arises from beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, the universe arises from the actions of beings in it. Actions are motivated by afflictions. Afflictions arose from knowledge obscuration of ignorance. The universe, therefore, arose from distant cause of ignorance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

You no longer wish to debate but for some reason you do while complaining about it.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not debating. I have no position to lose, or point to score. I am not discussing my own POV.

My purpose was to respond to Mariusz who produced a citation in which it can be easily shown that the ninth Karmapa, following the eighth, is engaging in the kind of straw man polemics Tibetan scholars are so famous for. Gorampa does it, Tsongkhapa does it [though he, like Rongton, is quite moderate in his production of strawmen], they all do it.

By immediately responding that Gorampa was wrong on this or that point, all you immediately do, if indeed you think he was an arya, is accumulate the negative merit of criticizing aryas.

I am attempting to encourage people to take a more constructive approach: instead of saying, as I have many times in the past, "Tsongkhapa was wrong to say that we may leave off the second two alternatives of the four extremes because they are double negatives", it is better to think long and hard why he might give such an opinion. Rather than immediately assume that Gorampa is wrong in asserting that Candrakirti accepts things like svasamvedana conventionally, it is better to ask yourself why he might assert that. These great scholars almost always have very solid reasons for saying what they do about this and that thing, and the thing is, we have to really question ourselves if we think something they said is wrong. That is my point.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

To say that Tibetans invented them is misleading.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not at all misleading. There were no separate schools of Madhyamaka in India [unless you count Yogacaras as Madhyamaka, and they certainly thought of themselves in this way.]

There was a difference in opinion among different Madhyamaka scholars about how best to use reasoning to refute opponents and that is the extent of it. The whole controversy hinged solely on Bhavaviveka's criticism of Buddhapalita for not using a fully formed syllogism to refute self-production; with Candrakirti coming to Buddhapalita's defense. End of story.

The development of a "Prasangika" school occurred at Sangphu because Phyapa and his students were hostile to Chandrakirti's texts when they were introduced by Batsap. Thus, the division between Prasangika and Svatantrika is wholly a Tibetan invention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 27th, 2012 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

cloudburst said:

Gorampa is making a mistake here.

In the MMK Nagarjuna is refuting inherent production, and it is in this context that he brings in the example of the lamp. All his consequences are designed to show that nothing is inherently produced.

Because lamps do dispel darkness conventionally, there are no contradictions conventionally. The contradictions arise when the analysis probes under the convention, and this is the beginning of analysis for the ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

If there were no contradictions, then these things could not be rejected ultimately. It is because these conventional entities do possess internal contradictions that they cannot bear ultimate analysis.

cloudburst said:

Chandrakirti clearly refutes the existence of the alaya even conventionally in the avatara and it's bhasya.

Malcolm wrote:

That is indeed what some people think. Other people think Candrakirti's view is more nuanced than that. Candrakirti, in citing the Lanka in the Bhasya, clearly states that ālayavijñāna is a synonym for emptiness, thus laying the ground for ālayavijñāna to be accepted conventionally.

cloudburst said:

Shantideva refutes self-cognition even conventionally in Bodhicharyavatara etc so Gorampa's defense of these is not based on good scholarship.

Malcolm wrote:

Santideva is rejecting a truly established mind and the argument of reflexive cognition that cittamatrins introduce to defend it. That is the context of Santideva's argument, and that is all.

cloudburst said:

Gorampa makes an error here as well:

"Someone's position that after one understands the passages which reject a reflexive cognition that is able to bear analysis have been understood from the MMK, the Vighavavyavartani and the Prasannapāda, one should apply them to a rejection of reflexive cognition conventionally is erroneous. [It is erroneous] because just as in the MMK a lamp illuminating itself is rejected having refuted the given example for reflexive cognition, a lamp, through analysis, since also removal of darkness [by a lamp] also rejected [in the MMK], the consequence would be that even conventionally [a lamp's ability] to remove darkness would not be acceptable.

the example of a lamp illuminating itself and others in MMK is used to show that there is no ultimate production. As for this, there is production conventionally, but not ultimately, just as a lamp does not illuminate itself or others ultimately. Conventionally, it does illuminate other, but is not self-illuminating.

Malcolm wrote:

So some would have it.

cloudburst said:

If we follow the position Gorampa puts forward, then even though things are contradictory conventionally, we should still accept them. This gives disastrous consequences. Without the ability to refute something conventionally as a result of internal contradictions in the position, we have no power to refute anything.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess you are not understanding Gorampa's point [which is why I find this whole exercise to be one of utter futility since you seem only interested in rejecting rather than understanding]. Gorampa is saying that conventional things possess internal contradictions — this fact [that they possess internal contradictions] is what allows them to be refuted ultimately. He is not saying that these internal contradictions are

what appear prior to analysis. Thus your statement is the kind of unthinking fault-finding that I find troublesome in these conversations to begin with and why I no longer wish to participate in these kinds of discussions.

You do not read Gorampa openly. You read him polemically. I.e. for every statement advanced, a fault is found, for every fault that is found, a counter fault is found, and it just goes on and on. It seems impossible that people are capable of enjoying the subtlety of Tsongkhapa, Gorampa, and so on because they are so caught up in their political parties.

I am not saying that Gorampa is better than you, for on this score, indeed he is not.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Evidence for Design?

Content:

mint said:

Design explains all the most important aspects of existence: truth, goodness, freedom, justice, beauty, love, the order of the universe, the origin of life, the progressive development and existence of rational, autonomous, moral beings who have the capacity for unselfish love and the right to life, freedom and self-determination.

Scientific evidence for design consists of:

1. The laws of nature which are necessary for life and a rational existence.
2. The directiveness of living organisms.
3. The progressive nature of development.
4. The information system contained in the DNA code.
5. The survival of life despite overwhelming odds.
6. The development of the most complex phenomenon in the universe: the human brain.
7. The existence of rational, autonomous, moral and responsible beings with a capacity for unselfish love.

What are your views?

Malcolm wrote:

"The variety of the world arises from karma."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

kirtu said:

The suttas referenced wrt merit transfer for dead relatives are the Sigaloavada Sutta, Tirokudda Kanda Sutta, and the Janussonin Sutta.

Malcolm wrote:

Sigaloavada Sutta has alms offered on behalf of the dead -- which is clearly a pre-Buddhist custom such as that mentioned in the first part of the Mahāparinibbana.

Tirokudda Kanda Sutta: has clean good and drink offered to pretas, but the merit accrued is one's own.

Janussonin Sutta: <http://online-dhamma.net/nanda/AccessToInsight/html/tipitaka/an/an10/an10.177.than.html> "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

This sutra says that gifts made to one's ancestors who have been reborn as hell beings, animals, gods or human cannot be enjoyed by them. However, gifts made to hungry ghosts can be enjoyed by them. In all cases the donor enjoys the merit of the gift.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

If we look at the controversies between great masters or schools in this way, they can be helpful as models to gauge and refine our personal insights.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I don't agree with this. Controversies merely breed more controversy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

If there were anything to be observed

Through direct perception and the other instances [of valid cognition],

It would be something to be established or rejected.

However, since no such thing exists, I cannot be criticized. [/i]

Malcolm wrote:

The point that Goramapa is making is that this is rejection of authority ultimately, not conventionally. The purpose of the Vigrahavyavartani is to reject svabhāva and the notion that there are inherently authoritative cognitions.

Nagarjuna is not rejecting conventional inference [anumāṇa] and direct perception [pratyakṣa] -- he is rejecting the notion that authorities [pramāṇa] and objects of authority [prameya] are inherently authoritative. He is also rejecting the argument in this text that since emptiness is not an object, it cannot lead to valid knowledge, since valid knowledge must come from truly valid direct perceptions and inferences based on objects of knowledge that truly exist.

Nagārjuna, Buddhapalita, Candrakīrti, as well as Śāntideva all use instances of conventional direct perception and inference in their writing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

However, these do not contradict the possibility the analysis for one's own help will lead to the collapse until realization? The analysis is not meaningless. As for Mahāmudrā or Dzogchen it can be also the support.

Malcolm wrote:

I told you in the very beginning that Karmapa was misrepresenting Gorampa's position.

I guess you have not understood what I was trying to say -- so please try to listen. If you are going to follow what some Tibetan says, fine. Pick one scholar. Follow their point of view. Unless you are prepared or capable of reading the scholars with which they choose to disagree, please do not jump on Team Goramapa, Team Tsongkhapa, Team Karmapa or Team Mipham. I have made that mistake in the past. I now clearly recognize that it is an error to jump on the bandwagon of Post-Indian Madhyamaka developments. It is one thing to try to understand the intellectual history of Tibetan Madhyamaka -- that can be interesting for some people. It is quite another to jump on the bandwagon of this or that school -- then this just becomes scholastic politics.

As far as Mahāmudrā and Dzogchen go, Madhyamaka is not absolutely required at all. While Madhyamaka can be a support, more often than not it turns into a meaningless intellectual game of proof and rebuttal, accepting and rejecting — leading to outlandish thread titles like the one that heads this thread.

What is meaningless is the endless games of dialectics [in which I have also played]

where each school and scholar triumphantly asserts that only they have the real key to Nagarjauna's intention. It is total nonsense.

What we do not need to transmitted to the West is the scholastic environment of competitive sectarianism. This helps not one's practice at all. When we see clear misrepresentations of one scholar's point of view by another, as we have in this thread, how can we trust any of it?

Without understanding the political background of anxiety of Kagyu and Sakya about the burgeoning success of the Gelug tradition, how can we fairly assess the criticisms of Tsongkhapa by Rongton, Gorampa, Shakya Chogden, and so on? Without understanding the relationship between Shakya Chogden and his Karma Kagyu patrons, how can we understand his seeming championship of the gzhan stong position? Without understanding the relationship between Rendawa Zhonnu Lodo and his very critical assessment of various schools and trends during his day, how can we understand the writing of his main disciple, Tsongkhapa? Without understanding the hostile reception Candrakirti's works met at Sangphu when they were initially translated by Batsab with Jayananda, how can we really understand the Tibetan invention of Prasangika and Svatantrika? All of these things must be understood by any responsible scholar of Tibetan Madhyamaka. And even more basic, the conditions that produced Indian Madhyamaka were quite different than the conditions that produced Tibetan Madhyamaka. Tibetans introduced all kinds of issues in their prosecution of Madhyamaka that would have never occurred to Indians. You have Tibetans arguing over points that to Indians would seem utterly irrelevant. I personally think Candrakirti would have been appalled at all the divisions and sub-divisions of Madhyamaka in which the Tibetans sincerely and earnestly engaged.

So please be more careful in future. And honestly, learn Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 8:46 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Namdrol said:

Merit is not shared in a real sense, but by sharing your merit you create much more for yourself.

xabir said:

So the story in the sutras about mogallana saving his mother in hell by dedicating merits have no basis in dharma at all?

Also, "according to the Sutra of The Great Vows of Ksitigarbha Bodhisattva, one can "transfer" 1/7 merit of an act they have performed to a deceased loved one"... You think this is not true?

Malcolm wrote:

If the transfer of merit could rescue beings from samsara, then considering that no one has greater merit than a Buddha, and no greater generosity, why have we not all been liberated?

In any event, I think the Ksitigarbha sutra is 100% Chinese apocrypha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 8:40 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Mariusz:

Let's examine what you initially introduced:

There are some, such as Gorampa and Shākya Chokden, who say that this verse [verse 6.75 of the Entrance] proves that Chandrakirti holds, from his own perspective, that self-awareness exists conventionally.

What does Gorampa actually say?

He says, quote "This master [Candrakirti] explains the all-basis, the afflicted mind, reflexive cognition and so on from authoritative citations. Even though no distinction of whether they are true or not is made, the internal contradictions of conventions are accepted conventionally, but the refutation of those upon analysis is maintained from the perspective of the ultimate."

He continues:

"Someone's position that after one understands the passages which reject a reflexive cognition that is able to bear analysis have been understood from the MMK, the Vigrahavyavartani and the Prasannapāda, one should apply them to a rejection of reflexive cognition conventionally is erroneous. [It is erroneous] because just as in the MMK a lamp illuminating itself is rejected having refuted the given example for reflexive cognition, a lamp, through analysis, since also removal of darkness [by a lamp] also rejected [in the MMK], the consequence would be that even conventionally [a lamp's ability] to remove darkness would not be acceptable. [It is erroneous] because when, in the Vigrahavyavartani, the self-evidential validity of that authoritative cognition is rejected, since validity through another is also rejected, the consequence would be that there can never be an authoritatively cognizing subject even conventionally. [Finally, it is erroneous] because when the Prasannapād cites sutras that state that a mind which experiences cognition without reflexive cognition cannot be found, the consequence would be that even the experiencing mind itself would not exist conventionally."

So you see, that passage is not about whether reflexive cognitions exist. The passage is

concerned with how Candrakirti treats citations concerning conventionality.

In this case, what is being affirmed is not reflexive cognition. What is being rejected is the Gelug over-negation of reflexive cognition through showing contradictions implicit in rejecting reflexive awareness, as well as other conventions, conventionally.

If this passage and its reasoning is not clear for you, I can explain it further. But it not a passage stating that reflexive cognition exists conventionally, it is a passage stating that reflexive cognition is to be accepted conventionally [i.e. without analysis], even if that convention contains many internal contradictions, which Gorampa admits that it does right up front. However, conventionally, those internal contradictions are not subject to analysis; just in the same way as when we turn on a light, we say "Turn on the light" in order to remove darkness, even though when analyzed, a light capable of removing darkness can never be found.

In other words, for Gorampa there is no doubt that these things like ālaya-vijñāna, the afflicted mind, and so on cannot bear analysis -- but as conventions we leave them alone with all their myriad internal contradictions just as we leave the convention that lamps remove the darkness of rooms alone.

For this reason, it is little irresponsible merely to just throw out soundbites of positions. I am sure that Gorampa's critique of Tsongkhapa's position [though I have not read it] on this issue also has problems, or that he selectively misreads Tsongkhapa's point of view and so on.

So just compare what Gorampa says here to the Jayananda citation I produced above. And for Buddha's sake man, at least learn Tibetan. I don't have time to do this in general!

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

Since meditation in Vajrayāna systems is based on an example wisdom gained during the introduction of the third and fourth empowerments, Gorampa points out in a treatise refuting some on Tsongkhapa's interpretations of the Guhyasamaja sadhana that it does matter very much what your intellectual view might be; whether cittamatra or madhyamaka, since your meditation is not based on an intellectual analysis, but rather a path wisdom derived from the introduction of third and fourth empowerment.

kirtu said:

Shouldn't this read:

that it does not matter very much what your intellectual view might be

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Thank you for catching that typo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

dakini_boi said:

What about the case of a Buddha liberating demons? While not exactly taking on their karma, if a Buddha can actually liberate them, then their karma is completely dismantled.

Malcolm wrote:

This is entirely symbolic -- demons arise because of your affliction and karma. When you have eliminated your own affliction and karma, then demons become gods.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

AlexanderS said:

Is negative karma cannot be taken, how can merit then be giving and shared?

Malcolm wrote:

Merit is not shared in a real sense, but by sharing your merit you create much more for yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

One becomes a rudra much more rapidly than other practices. It is a dangerous practice for one's ego.

The guardians of Drollo are the worldly eight classes, in general.

There is nothing more wrathful in any school.

Jikan said:

would such or similar dangers inhere also in practices that invoke Dorje Drollo, such as Trungpa's _Sadhana of Mahamudra_? (as opposed to a practice in which one takes the

same as a yidam)

Malcolm wrote:

The sadhana of mahamudra is a yidam practice.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

One becomes a rudra much more rapidly than other practices. It is a dangerous practice for one's ego.

The guardians of Drollo are the worldly eight classes, in general.

There is nothing more wrathful in any school.

AilurusFulgens said:

Thank you for the reply, Namdrol. Just one last question in this respect: are termas the exclusive source for all existant Dorje Drollo sadhanas or are there also other sources - like for instance tantras transmitted directly by Guru Rinpoche and coming down through various unbroken lineages i.e. sources, which are NOT termas?

Malcolm wrote:

Termas are the exclusive source.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

spanda said:

Could someone explain me, what exactly Milarepa did? Was Milarepa capable (if he wanted) to take someones else's suffering? If yes, this mean that he could "take"/reduce someone else karma?

Malcolm wrote:

This is a story in a Tibetan novel. Pure fiction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is a little complicated. But the long and short of it is that it is the most wrathful practice there is. If your view is very stable, then there is no problem, but if not. Drollos name is "krodha lokottara" i.e. "transcendent wrath" -- gro wo lod is a corruption of that.

AilurusFulgens said:

If you can talk about this in an open forum, may I then ask what exactly are the negative side-effects of the Dorje Drollo practice specifically i.e. in case something goes wrong?

What exactly would be the benefits if you do everything correctly? What precisely does the Dorje Drollo practice do - aside from the very general statement that it clears the obstacles?

Is the Dorje Drollo the most wrathful practice in all of Vajrayana or is this just valid for the Nyingma school?

A. Fulgens

Malcolm wrote:

One becomes a rudra much more rapidly than other practices. It is a dangerous practice for one's ego.

The guardians of Drollo are the worldly eight classes, in general.

There is nothing more wrathful in any school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

If you want to know Candrakirti's own point of view on this passage in the Madhyamaka - avatara from his autocommentary, however, well, here it is:

gang phyir gang gis yul myong 'gyur de las/ /dran pa 'di gzhan nga la yod min pa/ /de phyir nga yis mthong snyam dran 'gyur te/ /'di yang 'jig rten tha snyad tshul lugs yin/ /gang gis yul myong ba de yul nyams su myong ba'i shes pa de las dran pa'i shes pa gzhan nyid du ji ltar med pa de ltar na sngar bshad zin to/ /gang gi phyir dran pa gzhan nyid yod pa ma yin pa de'i phyir/ gang nyams su myong bas myong ba de dran pa'i shes pas myong ba ma yin pa ma yin pas dran pa yul dang ldan par 'byung la/ nyams su myong ba'i shes pas yongs su gcod pa gang yin pa de dran pas yongs su ma bcad pa ma yin pas bdag gis mthong ngo zhes bya bar 'gyur ro/ /'di yang 'jig rten tshul lugs yin gyi shin tu dpyad par

bya ba ni ma yin te/ brdzun pa'i don can nyid kyis 'jig rten gyi tha snyad yin pa'i phyir ro/

Mariusz said:

Ok. Give me a minute. I will translate it in google translator

Malcolm wrote:

Here is Jayanada's sub-commentary on this passage:

brjod par bya ste zhes bya ba la sogs pa gsungs te gang gis yul myong 'gyur zhes bya ba ni sngon po'i shes pa gang gis yul nyams su myong bar 'gyur ba'o/ /'di las dran pa 'di gzhan nga la yod min pa/ /zhes bya ba ni yul shes pa de la dran pa'i shes pa gzhan ma yin pa'o/ /de'i phyir nga yis mthong snyam dran 'gyur te/ /zhes bya ba ni gang gi phyir nyams su myong ba'i dran pa las dran pa'i shes pa gzhan nyid ma yin pa de'i tshe gang nyams su myong ba'i shes pas gang nyams su myong ba de nyid dran pa'i shes pas kyang nyams su myong ba yin pas ngas mthong snyam du dran par 'gyur ba'o/ /gal te shes pa rnams skad cig ma yin pa dang rang rig med pas ngas mthong ngo snyam du ji ltar dran zhe na/ de la lan ni/ 'di yang 'jig rten tha snyad tshul lugs yin/ /zhes bya ba gsungs te/ 'jig rten pa'i tha snyad brtag dpyad kyi go skabs med pas na 'jig rten na ci ltar yod pa de ltar khas blang bar bya dgos pas so; /des na 'jig rten pas rang rig med du zin kyang mthong ngo snyam pa'i tha snyad byed pas/ nyams su myong ba'i shes pa dag gcig tu zhen pa yin pas skyon yod pa ma yin no zhes pa'o/

Here is the salient point of the passage, to make of what you will:

/gal te shes pa rnams skad cig ma yin pa dang rang rig med pas ngas mthong ngo snyam du ji ltar dran zhe na/ de la lan ni/ 'di yang 'jig rten tha snyad tshul lugs yin/ /zhes bya ba gsungs te/ 'jig rten pa'i tha snyad brtag dpyad kyi go skabs med pas na 'jig rten na ci ltar yod pa de ltar khas blang bar bya dgos pas so; /des na 'jig rten pas rang rig med du zin kyang mthong ngo snyam pa'i tha snyad byed pas/ nyams su myong ba'i shes pa dag gcig tu zhen pa yin pas skyon yod pa ma yin no zhes pa'o/

"If it is asked, 'how is can there be a memory such as in the thought "It was seen by me" if cognitions are momentary but there is no reflexive cognition [rang rig, svasamvedana]?"

The reply to that is: 'This also is the standard of worldly convention.'

Since there is no opportunity to analyze the conventions of the worldly, however it seems in the world, it is necessary to accept it as such. Therefore, as the worldly also maintain there is no reflexive cognition [rang rig, svasamvedana], since the convention of the thought "it was seen" was generated, there is clinging to the cognitions of the experience [nyams su myong ba' shes pa dag] as being the same, thus there is no fault." Therefore we can infer from this that since Candrakirti rejects reflexive cognitions based on world convention, in order to be consistent he must accept outer objects since those too are accepted based on worldly convention.

Tibetans may now argue amongst themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

The Madhyamikas debate is always beneficial and healthy.

Malcolm wrote:

It might be if you were really talking about what Candrakirti and Nagarjuna said, but you are not -- you are arguing about what Tibetans say about categories of Madhyamaka invented wholly by Tibetans.

Mariusz said:

Can I ask personal question to Namdrol? Why did you not protest when questions to Tsongkhapa, but protest when questions to Gorampa?

Malcolm wrote:

You have forgotten that I spent several weeks defending Tsongkhapa from what I considered to erroneous criticisms of his view on e-Sangha.

You have also forgotten that when someone opined that one could not realize the meaning of Dzogchen if they held Tsongkhapa's point of view about "Prasangika" [Prasangika being a Tibetan invention, a term coined at Sangphu by Batsab Nyima Drag in the 12th century] I swiftly reminded them that both Jigme Lingpa and Shabkar upheld Tsongkhapa's interpretation of Prasangika.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 26th, 2012 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

Very excuse me. Madhyamaka is not meaningless.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say Madhyamaka was meaningless, I said that worrying about Tibetan scholastic nit picking this or that point was meaningless.

If that is really what you want to spend your life doing, then the only fair way to do it is to select the scholars from all four schools: present what each and everyone of them says about each passage in the Madhyamaka avatara for example with their refutations of each other's POV and leave it like that.

Otherwise, this cherry picking just leads to confusion and a very incomplete understanding and causes people to criticize amazing scholars we could not even withstand for five seconds in debate.

I am quite sure that if you read Tsongkhapa with a open mind, at the end of the day, you will be completely sure he is correct and perfect.

But then, I am quite sure that if you read Gorampa with a open mind, at the end of the day, you will be completely sure he is correct and perfect.

Then, I am quite sure that if you read Dolbupa with a open mind, at the end of the day, you will be completely sure he is correct and perfect.

Next, I am quite sure that if you read Mipham with a open mind, at the end of the day, you will be completely sure he is correct and perfect.

And it just goes on and on.

Why? Because there is no end to intellectual analysis.

If you want to know Candrakirti's own point of view on this passage in the Madhyamaka - avatara from his autocommentary, however, well, here it is:

gang phyir gang gis yul myong 'gyur de las/ /dran pa 'di gzhan nga la yod min pa/ /de phyir nga yis mthong snyam dran 'gyur te/ /'di yang 'jig rten tha snyad tshul lugs yin/ /gang gis yul myong ba de yul nyams su myong ba'i shes pa de las dran pa'i shes pa gzhan nyid du ji ltar med pa de ltar na sngar bshad zin to/ /gang gi phyir dran pa gzhan nyid yod pa ma yin pa de'i phyir/ gang nyams su myong bas myong ba de dran pa'i shes pas myong ba ma yin pa ma yin pas dran pa yul dang ldan par 'byung la/ nyams su myong ba'i shes pas yongs su gcod pa gang yin pa de dran pas yongs su ma bcad pa ma yin pas bdag gis mthong ngo zhes bya bar 'gyur ro/ /'di yang 'jig rten tshul lugs yin gyi shin tu dpyad par bya ba ni ma yin te/ brdzun pa'i don can nyid kyis 'jig rten gyi tha snyad yin pa'i phyir ro/

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Pero said:

I really doubt this. Anyone else heard the same elsewhere?

Namdrol said:

Yup.

Drollo practice can cause lots of obstacles.

Pero said:

Wow... But why is that? I thought Drollo was for clearing obstacles.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a little complicated. But the long and short of it is that it is the most wrathful practice there is. If your view is very stable, then there is no problem, but if not. Drollos name is "krodha lokottara" i.e. "transcendent wrath" -- gro wo lod is a corruption of that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Birth, Life and Death with Dr. Malcolm Smith

Content:

Mr. G said:

Namdrol,

Will this be offered in MP3 format for purchase at a later date for those that can't make it in person?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no idea -- that is a question for SSI.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Misdeeds cannot be washed away with water,
the suffering of living beings cannot be removed with the hand,
my realization cannot transferred to another,
but by showing the true nature of things, there will be liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

Spiny Norman said:

Good stuff, but I'm not sure about describing it as the "unity" of awareness and emptiness. Isn't it just awareness of emptiness?

Spiny

pensum said:

As you are not sure Spiny I strongly recommend you visit a lama...

Malcolm wrote:

He did that, decided Vipassana was more suited to his nature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

The term "self-liberation" is nothing new. For example is also in Dzogchen where "cutting through until primordial purity", or "the all is the play of Mahamudra" from the tradition IX Karmapa is.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference of course is introduction. There is no introduction in sutra, hence, no introduction for Madhyamaka.

Madhyamaka is not equivalent with Dzogchen and Mahamudra. As both Longchen pa and Jigme Lingpa points out, while the intellectual structure of the view of Prasanga and Dzogchen are identical i.e. free from all extremes, the former is based on an intellectual analysis whereas the latter is based on a personal experience.

In Dzogchen and Mahamudra meditation is based on an example wisdom. This is not the case with Madhyamaka.

Since meditation in Vajrayāna systems is based on an example wisdom gained during the introduction of the third and fourth empowerments, Gorampa points out in a treatise refuting some on Tsongkhapa's interpretations of the Guhyasamaja sadhana that it does matter very much what your intellectual view might be; whether cittamatra or madhyamaka, since your meditation is not based on an intellectual analysis, but rather a path wisdom derived from the introduction of third and fourth empowerment.

Therefore, I feel personally that all of this scholastic nit picking about Tibetan scholar's disagreements about what they think Indian scholars think is pretty much just an empty diversion. Hence the reason I lack patience with it, and am not very interested in defending Gorampa or criticizing Dolbupa, or Tsongkhapa, etc. I simply think that it is a waste of time.

If people want to spend their time reading books about Madhyamaka, I have no problem with that, but silly thread titles like "Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa" for me are meaningless. Honestly, who cares? (well obviously mariusz does). Also Gendun Chopel faults Gorampa for this and that point -- and there is no doubt the eighth Karmapa can be faulted for this and that point. It is all just meaningless dancing on books to me, something scholars do when they have a bit of free time for fun. The

whole history of Tibetan Buddhist scholastics is scholars faulting each other for this and that point.

That is why I recommend going back to the basics: If you want read Madhyamaka, read the originals. If you have to learn Tibetan or Sanskrit to do so, great. But honestly, all this "Tsongkhapa is wrong!" "Gorampa is wrong!" "Karmapa is wrong!" Dolbupa is wrong" is really nonsensical and just perpetuates a sectarian intellectual culture that we should leave behind.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

Pero said:

I really doubt this. Anyone else heard the same elsewhere?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Drollo practice can cause lots of obstacles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

Namdrol said:

...This is simply a fact.

gregkavarnos said:

Yup! And Department of Justice statistics verify this fact. But certainly there are other factors involved. For example, did you know though that "During the offense that brought them to prison, 15% of State inmates and 13% of Federal inmates carried a handgun, and about 2%, a military-style semiautomatic gun." So basically "only" 17% of convicted crimes were carried out using a firearm anyway?

Malcolm wrote:

Which puts to rest the notion that the US is a society filled with gun violence. It isn't.

gregkavarnos said:

Another factor may also be that underprivileged adolescent males (ie those most likely to commit violent crimes) have been shipped off (with fantastic economic incentives) to

kill and die in foreign lands (Iraq and Afghanistan) instead of in their own country since the mid-nineties?

Malcolm wrote:

No, only since 2003. The number of military personnel in the US was cut by a third under Clinton.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 10:27 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sherab:

Mind can never transcend itself. This is why intellectualism is useless.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The strange thing? In my fifteen years on the island there has not been a single reported instance of somebody shooting somebody dead using assault rifles. Not one. Actually, shooting deaths on the island are normally by shotgun and very rare. On the island of Crete, where they have a handgun culture that rivals even the US, people get shot and killed all the time. In Athens, again, mainly handguns and normally during robberies.

Malcolm wrote:

Though I am not a gun owner, and do not support the wide proliferation of firearms, however there is a very interesting fact about America: since the early 1990's, the number of guns of all kinds have proliferated enormously in the US, but the incidence of all crimes, including violent crimes of with guns, has steadily declined.

This is simply a fact.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

The suffering of chasing mirages never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.
The suffering of accepting and rejecting never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

Sherab said:

I can agree with these.

Namdrol said:

..likewise, the suffering of intellectual pursuits never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

..likewise, the suffering of proof and rebuttal never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

Sherab said:

I have a problem with these. Why? I cannot leave contradictions and paradoxes unresolved as they eat away at my faith/belief in the Dhamma/Dharma and disturb my mental peace. That's just me I guess.

Malcolm wrote:

intellectual pursuits are like mirages, always promising satiation and just creating more doubt.

Proof and rebuttal is merely intellectual accepting and rejecting.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

Sherab said:

However, all theses anecdotes do not square with what I was taught about karma .. that it cannot be taken away by someone else. But I think the suttas and sutras are silent about this. So what I've stated in my previous post is my way of resolving the impasse.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not silent about it. The sutras reject this idea explicitly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:51 AM

Title: Re: "taking someone else's negative karma"

Content:

spanda said:

...Therefore I wonder, is really impossible to take someone else karma, or it is possible in exceptional cases?

Sherab said:

My speculation:

Enlightened beings can take away the karma that you have already created but they cannot stop you from creating new karma. Without the stopping of creation of new karma, taking away karma already created is ultimately an exercise in futility.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite impossible, from a Buddhist pov.

However, in Hinduism, Jivanmuktis are considered able to accomplish this feat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Art and Initiations Question

Content:

Mr. G said:

I'm thinking of having a thangka commissioned to be done by a trained Tibetan Buddhist artist. This is a gift for a teacher later this year.

My question is, does the artist need to have already received initiation on the Yidam in order to paint it? I think the Yidam may be quite rare, so I'm curious.

Also, if anyone could give recommendations, that would be great. I was thinking of the following:

<http://www.tibetanpaintings.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://www.tashimannox.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Namdrol said:

Segei Noskov is quite excellent and fast, but he works with acrylics.

The tibetan painting people do quite excellent work, but they take three years.

Mr. G said:

Thanks Namdrol, I found his site:

<http://sergey-noskov.artistwebsites.com/index.html> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Do you think a thangka could be completed in a couple of months? I was hoping before June.

Also, the Yidam I want done is from a terma. Does one need initiation in the Yidam before painting?

Malcolm wrote:
not necessarily

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Art and Initiations Question

Content:

Mr. G said:

I'm thinking of having a thangka commissioned to be done by a trained Tibetan Buddhist artist. This is a gift for a teacher later this year.

My question is, does the artist need to have already received initiation on the Yidam in order to paint it? I think the Yidam may be quite rare, so I'm curious.

Also, if anyone could give recommendations, that would be great. I was thinking of the following:

<http://www.tibetanpaintings.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://www.tashimannox.com/> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Segei Noskov is quite excellent and fast, but he works with acrylics.

The tibetan painting people do quite excellent work, but they take three years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: ChNNR Dorje Drolo retreat

Content:

dakini_boi said:

At the end of the retreat this morning, Rinpoche mentioned there would be a Dorje Drolo retreat soon. He said it wouldn't be open, but would be on webcast - does that mean that DC members will be able to attend through webcast? Anyone have any more info on when it will be? Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, that means if you are a member of the DC you can log in to the webcast page using you pre-assigned user name and password.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

conebeckham said:

The imputation of existence, as well as the bifurcation into subject/object dichotomy, are both cognitive errors.

PadmaVonSamba said:

YEAH!

Paul said:

That reminds me of a thread that Namdrol once started in E-Sangha that started off a real atom of posts - the original post being something very terse like "Reality is a cognitive error". People went a bit crazy - it was very amusing.

Malcolm wrote:

"Sentient beings are nothing more than cognitive errors".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Bentinho Massaro - Is he there in a dzogchen sense?

Content:

wayland said:

Some pretty profound vids on YouTube by Bentinho Massaro.

I'm unsure what to make of them. Would you say that he is abiding in rigpa?

Is this a direct introduction to mind?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C6-J5BjWb9I> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tij5PtEtHvU&feature=related> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OaWfcrA6ByY&feature=related> "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

Not profound.

Not rigpa.
No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 11:21 AM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
Unknown said:
it is when you throw "existence/reality"

Malcolm wrote:
You need to examine your attachment to the imputation you label "reality". That is the rabbit horn to which you are attached.

But part of the problem is that what you think is real is the external whole. You are happy to accept that your mental functioning creates an illusory identity, but you seem to think inert things like lettuce to be more real than your mind. Minds and lettuce however are of a piece, they are both depend phenomena and therefore, amount to no more than passing illusions.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 4:13 AM
Title: Re: China party official warns members over religion
Content:
Beatzen said:
Marx was good at describing the structure of the cage, but in the end he offered no alternative to industrial capitalism. :p

Malcolm wrote:
Right, he thought the cage was progressive.

His nineteenth scientism is quaint and charming, but utterly irrelevant.

I much prefer Naess.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 3:00 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?
Content:

gregkavarnos said:

And what of the gun nut poster? It is not extreme, right? It's a balanced, moderate and objective view, right?

Namdrol said:

Not a shining example of moderation either.

David N. Snyder said:

Huh? Not sure what that is supposed to mean?

Good moderation is to allow all sides to have their say. I haven't moderated or censored anyone's posts here in this thread or others, including the ad hom and emotional ones against me or others.

Malcolm wrote:

Not that moderation. More in the line of "everything in moderation".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

I have a simple explanation for shared reality, you do not.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I do: functionality.

BTW, you seem to think I am trying to convince you Madhyamaka is correct -- I am not -- I am trying to help you understand what Madhyamaka is actually pointing out. Madhyamaka is not necessarily the appropriate POV for all practitioners.

Namdrol said:

So whatever clinging we have to any impermanent collection whether internal or external in terms of identity is certain to lead to suffering. This is the point of Madhyamaka i.e. to demonstrate that the belief that attributions of identity onto impermanent collections are anything more than mere conventions is a delusion. We agree on the internal part, we agree Madhyamaka extends this idea to external stuff, we've (hopefully) seen that I don't accept the latter, the meaning of "clinging to salt" is dubious and bears little relationship to "clinging to self" which, as you point out elsewhere, was Nagarjuna's main target in the first place.

Malcolm wrote:

The point was clinging to identity (atman). Atman, as you know, means self, it also means "essence" in Sanskrit, and it's synonym of svabhāva. This will be addressed below.

Namdrol said:

Of course these conventions work, but they are no more real than the habit of the "I" we attribute to our personal collection of aggregates. The habit of "I" certainly works, but that "I" is not real. The imputation of salt onto a given collection we have chosen to call salt "works" but the "salt" can't be found apart from the imputation we make onto that collection so we can use it effectively.

This flattening of external into internal just doesn't work for me, Namdrol. It looks elegant on the surface but loses too much "reality". And I have a strong suspicion that you and I have just about the same "salt experience."

Malcolm wrote:

Of course we do. Conventional truth is called "conventional" (vyavahāra) because it is based on empirically observed functionality shared by common people's ordinary healthy sense perception. What Madhyamaka rejects is that there is an salt atman or svabhāva, and further observes that claims for the existence of salt, or anything else for that matter, quickly become entangled with identity propositions.

Namdrol said:

Madhyamaka as a whole is an exercise in trying to introduce people to the real meaning of dependent origination i.e. the emptiness of persons and phenomena based in the Buddha's observation that statements about existence and non-existence were at odds with the real meaning of dependent origination.

Since there are no permanent phenomena, claims for the existence and non-existence of phenomena are completely naive on anything other than a conventional level.

"Permanent phenomena" is a straw man imho, a nonexistent used to assert something about existence. Impermanence is measurable, quantifiable, rocks persist longer than thoughts, let's not throw out the baby with the bath.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and for this reason, in the Majjhima Nikāya, the Buddha quips that if one must choose a self between the body and the mind, it is better to choose the body since it at least lasts for up to 80 years, whereas a thought lasts mere milliseconds.

But permanent phenomena is not such a straw man, since we see in physics a trend to try and prove "self-origination" through the big bang theory and so on.

Namdrol said:

So you can keep insisting that salt harms snails as much as you like. Since you are making a conventional statement you are not going to get any complaint from me, but if you assert that there is saltiness in salt, for example, you have only two courses -- mire yourself in the myriad contradictions of asserting that there is an essence of salt or simply accede the point that "salt" is a conventional identity proposition that is at best a functional imputation and nothing more than that.

I think we're going in circles, Sir. There are salt molecules. "Essence" is your word, your quagmire, I was just offering something for it to mean wrt salt.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, I am trying to explain to you that Madhyamaka states the self, the identity, the atman of any given phenomena, not merely personal phenomena, is merely an imputed label which derives from the functionality of that phenomena. The absence of identity in external phenomena does not obliterate them, indeed, from a Madhyamaka POV that absence of identity is all that makes them possible since whatever conditioned phenomena there are must be dependently originated and hence, must lack an intrinsic or unique identity, a "self", an essence, an atman.

We are not asserting, for example that dependent phenomenon are in the class of children of barren women or horns on rabbits or other such total non-existents -- which I suspect is your fear.

Dependent phenomena are free from both existence and non-existence since dependent phenomena are empty of a self or svabhāva, in other words, when a salt molecule ceases, there is no atman of salt that continues, and there is no atman of salt that ceases. When a salt molecule perishes all that has happened is that the causes and conditions for producing salt have ceased. Cessations are absence of causes, and are not caused per se.

If phenomena were to exist, they would not need causes and conditions, and since phenomena appear to be produced from causes and conditions, they are not non-existent either. They are not both existent and non-existent, since this is just a summary of the first extreme, and they are not neither, since this is just a summary of the second.

Therefore, since we cannot say that phenomena fall into one of these four extremes, Nagarjuna states dependent origination is free from eight extremes: in dependent origination there is no ceasing, arising, annihilation, permanence, going, coming, difference or sameness. He praises the Buddha for giving such a teaching because it frees one from ontological doubts i.e. pacifies proliferation.

All I am trying to get you to understand is that emptiness means that when you examine some conventional entity, something that we would say "exists out there in shared reality", there is no underlying reality proping it, apart from being labeled on the basis of functional appearances, such conventional entities cannot be found.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 24th, 2012 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism & Guns?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

And what of the gun nut poster? It is not extreme, right? It's a balanced, moderate and objective view, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Not a shining example of moderation either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Mariusz"]Is it means the distress is really produced? In contrast, let's look what

IX Karmapa wrote:

[/quote]

Of course not. There is no real production.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 11:31 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

[\\

At the end of the day, we would know that our saltiness experience required one of these saltiness producers and hope that it wasn't one of the nasty ones that causes zits. Sorry.

Malcolm wrote:

And at the end of the day, we will still be left with the fact that all of these so called "things" are just imputations of identity onto impermanent collections, which themselves are composed of still further impermanent collections.

So whatever clinging we have to any impermanent collection whether internal or external in terms of identity is certain to lead to suffering. This is the point of Madhyamaka i.e. to demonstrate that the belief that attributions of identity onto impermanent collections are anything more than mere conventions is a delusion.

Of course these conventions work, but they are no more real than the habit of the "I" we attribute to our personal collection of aggregates. The habit of "I" certainly works, but that "I" is not real. The imputation of salt onto a given collection we have chosen to call salt "works" but the "salt" can't be found apart from the imputation we make onto that collection so we can use it effectively.

The problem most laypeople have with the MMK is that people rarely are acquainted with the views that MMK is seeking to correct. Without understanding Abhidharma,

most of the arguments in the MMK will seem rather pointless if not obscure in the extreme. Some people mistakenly think that MMK is a panacea -- when in fact it is rather narrow text with a rather narrow project i.e. to correct Abhidharma realism and bring errant Abhidharmikas back to a proper understanding of dependent origination and help them to abandon a kind of naive essentialism that had crept into Buddhism.

Madhyamaka as a whole is an exercise in trying to introduce people to the real meaning of dependent origination i.e. the emptiness of persons and phenomena based in the Buddha's observation that statements about existence and non-existence were at odds with the real meaning of dependent origination.

Since there are no permanent phenomena, claims for the existence and non-existence of phenomena are completely naive on anything other than a conventional level.

So you can keep insisting that salt harms snails as much as you like. Since you are making a conventional statement you are not going to get any complaint from me, but if you assert that there is saltiness in salt, for example, you have only two courses -- mire yourself in the myriad contradictions of asserting that there is an essence of salt or simply accede to the point that "salt" is a conventional identity proposition that is at best a functional imputation and nothing more than that.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 10:24 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

In this sense, saltiness is an inherent quality of salt molecules, guilty as charged.

Tom said:

Quick question for Dave, and apologies if this interrupts the flow of debate - it is a quick one ...

I'm interested to know if you consider substances, say for example salt, that bear qualities, in this instance saltiness, to be more than conceptual fictions?

yadave said:

Hi Tom.

Yes.

Regards,
Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

I think the real question is, do you accept that these substances are intrinsically real, qualitatively real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Saltiness arises when we combine salt molecules with a tongue. I get that. If we look at all the tastes a tongue provides and ask which ones are salty, what do we find? Salt molecules.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi dave, that's just not true. Monosodium glutamate is not salt. But it produces a salty taste.

There are lots of things that taste salty, that have no salt in them.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

So then, the question becomes: "to what may one apply the term "exist?"

...and you are saying that "exist" can apply to conditionally arising phenomena,

...and (I believe) Namdrol is saying that it is erroneous to apply the term "exist" to conditionally arising phenomena.

.
.
.

Malcolm wrote:

As the Buddha specified:

Dvayaṃnissito kho'yaṃ kaccaana loko yebhuyyena atthita—ceva natthita—ca
Kaaccana, this world abides in duality, normally abiding in 'is' and 'is not'.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

I think if we place one salt molecule on a snail and watch under a microscope we will see tiny bubbles. Not sure what you mean yet.

Malcolm wrote:

Salt molecules do not produce this effect all by themselves. You need a snail for that.

The rest is pointless to respond to.

I was not making a Madhyamaka claim, but the way with pointing out the *karana* *hetu*. *Karana* *hetu* (what you mistook as a Gaia statement) is a *Abhidharma* claim which Madhyamakas assert is merely a convention that cannot withstand analysis, like salt.

The point of that description however, was that conventionally speaking, Madhyamakas are generally considered to accept production from another, even if this does not withstand ultimate analysis, it is the conventional mode Madhyamakas are comfortable with because it accords with dependent origination. Thus salt a dependent collection upon which term salt is applied, the same goes for cars, persons and everything else without the need for some non-dependent entity to exist which can serve as a basis for designation.

Salt molecules are not independent entities, so "salt" therefore, is just a dependent designation on a collection, like "Dave" and "Malcolm".

The absolute truth of salt, Dave and Malcolm is emptiness i.e. that when salt, dave and malcolm are sought as distinct entities in their respective collections, nothing can be found apart from a designation upon a collection.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Right, but this is why we stopped looking for salt beyond a salt molecule earlier because all the smaller stuff isn't salty.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why for you saltiness is an inherent quality and intrinsic characteristic. But if you try to find salty in a salt molecule, you will not find it.

Look at the examination of intrinsic characteristics in the MMK.

but it is hopeless, you already decided you are a "realist" and that things "really exist".

Madhyamaka is not antirealist, Madhyamaka is beyond the extremes of "real" and "unreal".

Madhyamaka can be considered "antirealism" to the extent that realism is a wrong view, but not because Madhyamaka proposes there are "unreal" things.

To change the terms a little, "It is not that we claim that things are unreal, we merely remove claims of real things".

Salt is merely an imputation on a collection, but there is no real salt in salt. Dave is likewise an imputation on a collection, but there is no Dave in Dave. If would look for Dave in the collection called "Dave", where are we going to find it? In your head, brain, heart, liver, hand, etc? Apart from your head, liver, etc.? The same analysis of the person, by which we discover that persons are merely designations on a collection, must be extended to phenomena. That is the intent of Madhyamaka. In other words, just as the term car is merely a designation on a collection of parts, and not car is found in a car, likewise, we can make the same observation for all compounded phenomena. People are not one case and cars and salt another.

N

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

kirtu said:

How would Gorampa critique it?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

As I explained elsewhere, according to Goramap the imputation of mere existence is sufficient to produce this distress.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 6:27 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"inherent existence" is an abstract concept only appearing to an onto-analytical consciousness of a philosopher, and even then not usually when he's drinking tea!

kirtu said:

No - inherent existence is an emotional grasping to objects. If someone broke a favourite cup then this causes emotional distress with most people who liked that cup. Grasping to inherent existence of phenomena takes place before conscious thought and is a product of momentary ignorance of impermanence and dependant origination.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Gorampa would not agree with this assessment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 6:25 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

cloudburst said:

Though you bridle, it is actually a form of obscurantism that you will not admit up front that you are using the term "existent" in a specialized sense. As a result, newbies can't figure out what you are saying.

Malcolm wrote:

I regularly qualify that in Madhyamaka the term "existent" is used in a very specific way. I discovered this through a close reading of Buddhapalita many years ago -- this is one of the reasons why I cite him more frequently than others.

Namdrol said:

There is some disagreement among Tibetans as to what we are not supposed to find. However, when we clearly identify that the object of our investigation is a truly existent phenomena, for example, the body that we normally perceive with our faulty perception, all schools agree that it does not exist in any way. We all fail to find the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that not all Tibetans agree that this is all we are supposed to find, i.e. the non-existence of a "chos bden par sgrub pa", a truly existent phenomena. Many Tibetans assert, and have done so for centuries prior to Tsongkhapa, that not only are we to not find truly existent phenomena, we are indeed to find no phenomena at all which exist according to any of the four extremes. If these Tibetans are incorrect, then how can we accept the realization of any Tibetans prior to Tsongkhapa, or in any school that differs in opinion with his view? How are we for example to accept the realization of Atisha, Milarepa, etc.?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

The emptiness of salt does not prove salt does not exist, it merely removes the claim that there is an existent called "salt" When salt is analyzed, no salt is found in salt. There is no entity among the components of salt that make salt salt.

yadave said:

Salt molecules are entities, conditioned entities, the smallest things we find that have properties we know of that make salt salt, make salty taste salty. What are you looking for?

Malcolm wrote:

If salt molecules are conditioned entities they are unable to act as salt alone. Hence there is no "salt" in the appearance we are labeling salt because the conditions which support the appearance of "salt" do not end at "salt molecules", do they? Salt molecules, we will readily, are conditioned entities upon which we label the aggregate we are calling salt. But a salt molecule itself is an aggregate, and so and so forth. A salt molecule cannot act as salt, it must be in an aggregate to have that function. And a given salt molecule itself cannot function without the aggregate upon which it depends. And that dependence has both depth as well as extension i.e. not only does it depend on its own specific causes and conditions, but its dependence is lateral, since it depends the presence of the element of sodium, chloride, as has been mentioned above. Not only does salt molecule depend on these two elements, it depends on conditions of pressure, heat, and so on. So a great deal more goes into producing the appearance we are labeling salt mere salt molecules. In fact, the presence of salt molecules is dependent on every other phenomena in the universe i.e. karana hetu or "creative cause" or the "dominant condition" the principle that all phenomena are causes for all other phenomena apart from themselves. When all of this is taken into consideration, as any proper analysis must, we find that in a very real sense salt is empty of salt just as persons are empty of persons, and just as all conditioned phenomena are empty of conditioned phenomena.

Whatever arises dependently, that is empty -- that is Nagarjuna's message -- there is no place where we say "Oh, we can stop our analysis here". If you stop your analysis, you are in effect making a claim of independence, at least, that is what Nagarjuna is trying to force you to admit.

yadave said:

Well I apologize, Namdrol, I know we've been through this, but we do find a basis for our labels.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if we arbitrarily limit our analysis of dependent relations. And if we limit that analysis, the Madhyamakas will try to force us to admit that we have made a claim about essences.

yadave said:

The only way I can make sense of your assertion is by imagining some kind of blocks world where we are looking for a smallest indivisible block to label. But we don't do this when looking for the smallest component of salt, we label this "salt molecule." For Padma's composite thunderstorm, we find a basis consisting of wind, rain, lightning, an array of composite entities that we collectively label "thunderstorm." We don't include "airplanes" in our collection because they are not required to have a "thunderstorm."

Malcolm wrote:

Airplains and all other phenomena are required, it is intrinsic to the logic of the six causes and four conditions, which are the six causes and four conditions that Nagarjuna sets out and dismantles completely in the first chapter of the MMK.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

in the west, it was Heidegger who pointed out that in our everyday lives, we don't really notice the cup at all: we just use it. we take it from the cupboard, pour tea in it, drink from it, wash it and put it away without ever thinking about it at all! so not only do we not perceive a cup's "inherent existence", we normally don't even perceive its existence as an object for a subject at all! its only when the handle falls off or it breaks that we even notice the cup as a cup, it puts us in an entirely different state of consciousness in relation to the cup. the point is that the "philosophical" activity of contemplating the cup's existence or lack of it, is a quite artificial one to begin with. So, if conventional reality is defined in Madhyamaka as the way the world unthinkingly goes about its business with "objects" that function, then its really more the way Heidegger says it is, and certainly not the way tsongkhapa says. "inherent existence" is an abstract concept only appearing to an onto-analytical consciousness of a philosopher, and even then not usually when he's drinking tea!

Malcolm wrote:

Nagarjuna was critiquing the notion that a cup is there. He was critiquing how common everyday language is misleading. Hence his famed refutation of movement:

"Apart having moved or not having moved, there is no present movement".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

There is some disagreement among Tibetans as to what we are not supposed to find.

PadmaVonSamba said:

Tibetans put salt in their tea.

Malcolm wrote:

Is this really a helpful statement? If so how? If people spent less time being smart asses and trying to be clever, this conversation might be more worthwhile.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

My concern is when folks begin claiming that "emptiness of salt proves salt does not exist"

Malcolm wrote:

The emptiness of salt does not prove salt does not exist, it merely removes the claim that there is an existent called "salt" When salt is analyzed, no salt is found in salt. There is no entity among the components of salt that make salt salt.

It is the same for any composite entity. We experience an appearance, we impute a label upon it, this act lets us work with that appearance. When we examine the appearance to find the basis for the label, however, none can be found. That non-finding is the emptiness of the appearance in question.

There is some disagreement among Tibetans as to what we are not supposed to find.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Virgo said:

Just that it exists, but before I studied I thought there was actual "cup" and not just rūpa.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

What is the difference between "actual" and "exists"? Nothing substantive, as far as I can tell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It is not that people perceive things to exist, it's that they perceive things to exist inherently.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the unproven assertion at the heart of Tsongkhapa's system.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

Gorampa points out that Tsongkhapa's first assertion is untrue, since inherent existences does not appear

Virgo said:

But don't sentient beings naturally impute or assume this?

Malcolm wrote:

That is what Tsongkhapa believes and what Gorampa rejects.

You can ask yourself the question very simply-- when you see a cup of coffee, do you think, even for a second, that it exists inherently? Or do you merely accept that it is exists there?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

My understanding is that the Prasangikas who follow Gorampa completely deny the validity of conventional truth. For them, conventional truths are completely false objects appearing to an ignorant mind, so when you become enlightened, you do not perceive conventional truths. Tsongkhapa teaches that conventional and ultimate truths are mutually supportive and equally valid (albeit that conventional truths incorrectly appear as inherently existent to non-Buddhas) and that Buddhas realize the union of conventional and ultimate truth simultaneously.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that for Tsongkhapa, conventional truths are able to withstand ultimate analysis since all that is being analyzed is the subtle object of negation, inherent existence, not the existence, of a conventional truth.

For Gorampa, they can not, since no phenomena can survive examination via the course object of negation, existence. Gorampa accepts that Candrakirti specifically identifies (in the Prasannapāda) a subtle object of negation, but according to Gorampa, it is just a formal identification since inherent existence is automatically eliminated when existence itself is analyzed.

According to Tsongkhapa, what is being misperceived by sentient beings in conventional truths is the inherent existence of conventional truths i.e. he claims that when an ordinary person sees a chair, they are seeing an inherently existent chair. However, Tsongkhapa also claims that ordinary sentient beings are incapable of distinguishing between mere existence and inherent existence.

Gorampa points out that Tsongkhapa's first assertion is untrue, since inherent existence does not appear, and Tsongkhapa's second assertion is self-contradictory, sentient beings only see existences, not inherent existences.

Tsongkhapa replies that conventional truths are linguistic entities, mental imputations, and that therefore, the notion of inherent existence is embedded in all imputations of conventional truth. Gorampa counters that this interpretation of conventional truth is faulty, since in fact relative truths are first and foremost appearances to a deluded mind, and what such a deluded mind grasps is not a truly existent object, but rather a merely existing object, and imputations of inherency are confined to the philosophical speculations of scholars, not the naive imputations of ordinary persons such as Chai wallas, who would never imagine their tea cups had some intrinsic nature that made them teacups.

So, at base, a large part of the disagreement hinges on how these two masters understand conceptual operations in sentient beings and what they understand Nagarjuna, Buddhapaṇita and Candrakīrti to be saying about such conceptual operations. This is why Tsongkhapa places such importance on separating and

identifying the correct object of negation, and why Gorampa thinks that such an effort misses the point and is unnecessary, since the coarse object of negation is sufficient for removing wrong views via the classic tetralemma (in ordinary persons -- awakened persons have no need of the caturskoti).

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 23rd, 2012 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

Namdrol said:

In the early period of Buddhism, there were two yānas, śamatha yāna and vipaśyāna yāna; beginners went to Śariputra to training in vipaśyāna for stream entry; then they would go train in śamatha with Maudgalyana for further progress.

Lance Cousins wrote a very interesting article about this.

Mr. G said:

Hi Namdrol,

Do you recall the name of the article, or if the article was published in a book? I just searched on JSTOR and didn't find anything.

Malcolm wrote:

Cousins, L.S., 1984, 'Samatha-yāna and vipassanā-yāna' in Dhammapala D., et al., eds, Buddhist

Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhatissa, Nugegoda, Sri Lanka, pp. 56-68.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings...

Content:

catmoon said:

The idea that Dharma is the cause and Dzogchen the result can't possibly be universal, simply because there are billions of Buddhists who are not Dzogchenpas.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, the point being made is that Dzogchen is the cause and basis for all dharma traditions, whether of samsara or nirvana. But I don't expect anyone to accept that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Anders Honore said:

I am not sure how one can possibly avoid existence and non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the purpose of dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

Spiny Norman said:

Actually I think in the early teachings samatha and vipasyana were not seen as separate activities anyway.

Spiny

Malcolm wrote:

In the early period of Buddhism, there were two yānas, śamatha yāna and vipaśyāna yāna; beginners went to Śāriputra to training in vipaśyāna for stream entry; then they would go train in śamatha with Maudgalyana for further progress.

Lance Cousins wrote a very interesting article about this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

cloudburst said:

In the meantime, since we both know you cannot take your own advice, please feel free to continue debating!

Malcolm wrote:

I have very little interest in debate, since debate generally consists of dancing on books.

However, please do not confuse my sincere answers to questions as debate, since that

is not my intent. My days of debating this point and that point are finished.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

There are some, such as Gorampa and Shākya Chokden, who say that this verse [verse 6.75 of the Entrance] proves that Chandrakīrti holds, from his own perspective, that self-awareness exists conventionally. They also say that in Chandrakīrti's tradition the all-base, self-awareness, outer objects, and the person all exist conventionally, but they do not exist as "conventional phenomena that can withstand analysis."

These positions are untenable. The master Chandrakīrti does not, as his own position, accept any phenomenon as existent or nonexistent in either ultimate or conventional truth

Anders Honore said:

Stupid outsider question here that I am sure has been covered a thousand times in the endless Prasāṅgika/Svatantrika debates, but what exactly is wrong with saying that things exist conventionally? How could there even be language if we did not play along with the convention that things exist?

Malcolm wrote:

This is all nauseating hair-splitting by Tibetan scholars with nothing better to do with their time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

As you see the topic is linked to our discussion in Mādhyamika Sautrāntika vs Prasāṅgika forum, so I think it is beneficial.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. Don't care.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

catmoon said:

Um, if mercury sulfate

Malcolm wrote:

My error, mercury sulfide.

In any case, detoxified mercury is not a commonly used medicine, because it is difficult to make, and if prepared improperly, can harm the patient. That being said, it is used, it is prepared, and when used properly, is quite beneficial for many diseases.

Quite frankly, people get all het up about mercury, but think nothing of doing chemo.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 22nd, 2012 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

dumbbambu said:

really?

Malcolm wrote:

Really.

Though my vehicles are inconceivable,
they are included in two categories:
samsara and nirvana.

--Rig pa rang shar tantra, the main explanatory tantra of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

cloudburst said:

In context, as explained above, we can see that since what Nagarjuna is talking about here is essential existence, it must either be svabhava or parabhava, and as you correctly point out, parabhava is actually just a form of svabhava.

thanks!

Namdrol said:

For Nag. that is the only kind of existence there could be i.e. bhāva = svābhava.

cloudburst said:

It would seem then that his principal disciples failed to understand him as they repeatedly refer to things existing conventionally, as did Buddha, upon whose explanations Nagarjuna's work is based.

I know precisely what you are trying to say. You are just having a awful, self-contradictory time doing it.

If svabhava, exhaustively refuted by Nagarjuna, were the only way in which things could exist, nothing would exist in any way.

Malcolm wrote:

As Buddhapalita states:

"It is not that we assert non-existence, we merely remove claims for existing existents".

Your concern is to maintain people's conventional sense of reality.

The Madhyamaka concern is to remove people's false conceptions.

See my post over in the Gorampa thread. All of this discussion is just chasing illusions and being wrapped in accepting and rejecting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Namdrol said:

You go first. Tell me where Gorampa actually says this. It is not sufficient to produce a charge without providing evidence.

Mariusz said:

My quote of the Karmapa is already in the first post where "The Feast for the Fortunate. A Commentary on the Entrance to the Middle Way That Easily Pulls Along the Chariot of the Takpo Kagyü Siddhas " of the Karmapa;

2.2.2.1.1.6.2.3.1.1.1.2.1.1.2.2.2.2.1.2.2.2.2.2. (Refuting claims that the above refutation applies equally to our own explanation of memory).

Malcolm wrote:

Not playing. This kind of thing for me is no longer of any importance. But I do suggest that those who are interested may read Gorampa for themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

ccording to the Karmapa for Gorampa "outer objects exist conventionally" somewhere "out there" although can not withstand analysis.

Namdrol said:

This is a misrepresentation of Gorampa' view, thus it is worthy of no further consideration.

Mariusz said:

Why do you think it is a misrepresentation? Can you quote please?

Malcolm wrote:

The suffering of chasing mirages never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop. likewise, the suffering of intellectual pursuits never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

The suffering of accepting and rejecting never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

likewise, the suffering of proof and rebuttal never ends. The only way to end it is simply to stop.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jikan said:

good morning webcasters

Malcolm wrote:

good morning!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

cloudburst said:

In context, as explained above, we can see that since what Nagarjuna is talking about here is essential existence, it must either be svabhava or parabhava, and as you

correctly point out, parabhava is actually just a form of svabhava.

thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

For Nag. that is the only kind of existence there could be i.e. bhāva = svābhava.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

catmoon said:

OMG are you guys serious? You are eating things laced with mercury and arsenic? That's crazy dangerous.

Malcolm wrote:

Arsenic is not present in all Shilajit.

"Mercury" used in Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine is a form of processed mercury, processed into mercury sulfate, which is inert in the human body, but very useful for treating many kinds of serious diseases. Mercury preparations are not commonly dispensed, however.

Both Ayurvedic and Tibetan medical texts are filled with warnings about using and handling raw mercury.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Anyone Know Anything About This?

Content:

alpha said:

So, for those who run the international dzogchen community is social networking something unacceptable?

Malcolm wrote:

No, but putting up websites that represent the community without checking is unacceptable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 8:26 PM

Title: Re: Gorampa untenable according to Karmapa

Content:

Mariusz said:

According to the Karmapa for Gorampa "outer objects exist conventionally" somewhere "out there" although can not withstand analysis.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a misrepresentation of Gorampa's view, thus it is worthy of no further consideration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 10:09 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Nemo said:

I think there may be more than one type of shilajit and they have different properties.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Traditionally there are several kinds, depending on what minerals are present in it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 10:08 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Nemo said:

It's not the same as it was years ago. It used to come from the Himalayas and was black.

Malcolm wrote:

Try Siddhi Energetics stuff. It is from Ladakh and it is as black as obsidian. Tell em I sent you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: Anyone Know Anything About This?

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

So does anyone have any idea what the actual problems with Dzogchen World were? The reasons for shutting it down were not at all clear to me in that email.

Malcolm wrote:

They did not get the sign off of the international Gakyil among other issues. There are

fairly rigid guidelines about what an official DC website can be.

I don't think that they anticipated social networking, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Jikan said:

Kundalini is mentioned in _The Crystal and the Way of Light_ (p. 124) in a way that is a bit confusing. is it thigle, is it prana... ?

wisdom said:

Ah! It seems to indicate that thigle/kundalini is the essential nature of prana. It reads: There are many types of prana, and they support the many types of dualistic mind; as long as the prana circulates in the many various channels, these dualistic minds persist. But when prana is brought into the central channel, its essential nature -thigle, or kundalini- is activated and enters the channels. Dualistic mind is then overcome, and realization achieved.

So its not saying prana is kundalini (which accords also with what Hindu tantra believes) but that when prana is brought into the central channel, its essential nature manifests as thigle or kundalini. In the same way, the mind has its thoughts, imputations, and so forth, and its essential nature which can be revealed.

Malcolm wrote:

In the Guhyasamaja system, bindu refers to a bindu of prana vāyu. Bindu therefore can refer to prana vāyu.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Clarence said:

Kundalini energy? I thought Buddhists don't recognize Kundalini? Namdrol-la, how are we to understand that?

Malcolm wrote:

The term kundalini never occurs in any buddhist texts. But the notion of unblocking the nadis of the cakras from the bottom cakra on up does exist in Buddhist tantras.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

In reading

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=96&t=4893&p=50672&hilit=Shilajit#p50672>,
it looks like Shilajit is more-or-less neutral temperature-wise, yet leaning a little towards warming.

Malcolm wrote:

You are right, I was in error. In Tibetan medicine is used to reduce fevers.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Beatzen said:

I knew that the mahayana extended that absense to external phenomenon. But when it's analysis of the inner self, is it "emptiness of self" instead of where the pali would dictate "no self"?

Malcolm wrote:

These two terms are identical in meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Beatzen said:

Namdrol, is there a variance between teachings of anatman and shunyata?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna traditionally maintains that the Pali canon and its kin and the traditions that derive from them focuses on teaching the emptiness of persons only and do not in general extend the analysis of absence of identity to phenomena themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

Paul said:

Thanks for posting that. It's reminded me of something that Erik Pema Kunsang said recently - that Dzogchen is beyond both a gradual path and an instantaneous path. It's far more complex than those two categories.

Malcolm wrote:

From my point of view, it is far less complicated; Dzogchen in a real sense is not a path, it is one's state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Kilaya said:

Video connection is working, too. Tenerife guys must have read our complaints and did something about bandwidth.

Namdrol said:

If you are in tenerife, then you are not listening the actual retreat....

There is a glitch where a recorded retreat is at the shang shung address.

Use this

<http://www.freezecast.com:8000/audio> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Kilaya said:

Rinpoche is presently speaking about sacred places. Am I listening to the actual retreat?

Malcolm wrote:

yes

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Is taking medication a sin?

Content:

waqqashokhar said:

I am an academic researching this topic from the point of view of patients asked to take medication which may have religiously forbidden ingredients e.g. Gelatine or stearic

acid.

Would like to know that in the context of vegetarianism being accepted practice in many Buddhist traditions, is there any dietary law that prohibits any specific animals or use of animal products in medication?

Would appreciate comments, suggestions for further reading or expert opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, the traditional Buddhist medicine is Ayurveda and there are kinds of meat, as well as urines, feces, etc., recommended as remedies for diseases in Ayurvedic texts as well as texts on Tibetan Medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 21st, 2012 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Kilaya said:

Video connection is working, too. Tenerife guys must have read our complaints and did something about bandwidth.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are in tenerife, then you are not listening the actual retreat....

There is a glitch where a recorded retreat is at the shang shung address.

Use this

<http://www.freezecast.com:8000/audio> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

Namdrol said:

But is said also in the suttas that the Buddha once levitated to an elevation of 14 palm trees.

PadmaVonSamba said:

maybe they were teensy weensy trees.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but even levitating half an inch off the ground is pretty damn amazing, don't you think?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Big Mind, Big Money, Big Scam

Content:

BuddhaSoup said:

I'm just amazed that Genpo stills markets himself as Roshi, and a Zen Master.

Malcolm wrote:

He's got bills, like everyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Unseen Beings in Tibetan Buddhism

Content:

Paul said:

Is there such a thing as a poltergeist in Tibetan buddhism? I seem to remember mention of a type of being with "power over the movement of objects" in a sangcho text and it sounded very similar.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: James Low & Simply Being

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

... He just uses different terms like "staying in the I AM" ...

Sönam said:

It does not sound very dzogchen ...

Sönam

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. Not very dzogchen at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Thug4lyfe said:

Isn't that the same thing what most other Mahayana schools are teaching? If all Dharma gates are equal, why does it sound like your trying to say Dzogchen is da best au? Know wat im sayin?

Astus said:

Sectarian thinking never becomes outdated.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people might think that is what is behind my statement, but they would be mistaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 10:47 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

People, hummingbirds, and snails must all "go around the tree" to get to the other side. Words and perceptions may differ, but the "tree" is real in this sense and no personal hubris of mine causes this to be so.

Namdrol said:

But some people don't.

yadave said:

Namdrol, are you saying some people go through the tree, as in walking through a wall?

Regards,

Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

One day Candrakirti was walking through a passageway in Nalanda, his head in a book, and he bumped his head on a pillar -- a student saw this and said "Aha! That pillar is not so empty, is it!". Candra looked at him, and passed his hand right through the pillar much to the student's embarrassed astonishment. Or so this traditional story runs.

Of course there is kashina meditation -- ostensibly, if you meditate on the kashina of earth, you gain control over the earth element and can travel through mountains, etc.

It is my opinion that the apparent solidity of phenomena such as trees and rocks, etc., is directly related to the solidity of one's delusion. The more solid one's delusion, the more solid apparent phenomena seem.

On the other hand, people with very solid delusions regularly kill themselves too, through not recognizing that solid things will kill them, like the ground when they attempt to fly off buildings.

But is said also in the suttas that the Buddha once levitated to an elevation of 14 palm trees. Such yogic feats are described too often in Buddhist texts generation after generation for me to simply reject them out of hand.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 10:11 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

People, hummingbirds, and snails must all "go around the tree" to get to the other side. Words and perceptions may differ, but the "tree" is real in this sense and no personal hubris of mine causes this to be so.

Malcolm wrote:

But some people don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: How "Old School" of an Internet user are you?

Content:

kirtu said:

Way back when I do played around with the Altair 8800, PET, etc. My first personal machine was in Germany and was an Atari 800. I've been online permanently since 1984 both on the Internet and BBS's and was probably on BBS's a bit while in Germany (so maybe from '83). Of course we had email even before that in college but no Arpanet access then (maybe Arpanet was just for college professors and researchers at that time).

I played around with Minitel in Strassbourg in early fall 1983 when visiting a friend there.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Had a mac in 85, never bothered with BBoards though I knew what they were. Got first modem in 1994 along with second mac. Found AOL., etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Namdrol has me pulling out my Jay Garfield MMK and I remember an important term missing from this list. Jay says (page 220) "Essence by definition is eternal and independent" so

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but the point is that Nag. equates existence (bhāva) with svabhāva (essence in this translation). In other words, Nag. is asserting that bhāva is svabhāva by necessity.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 20th, 2012 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Nemo said:

Where does Shilajit come from now? It is a completely different colour than it was years ago.

Did Nagarjuna leave any of his recipes for mercury medicines? I just read about his alchemical practices last night. Perhaps we should dig up his old recipes for turning iron into gold to support the Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Shilajatu is a kind of bitumous exudate that oozes from cliffs in the heat of summer.

Nagarjuna's method of processing mercury into mercury sulfate still exists and is used in Tibetan medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Nagarjuna view is clarified by his last student Chandrakirti that there is no such thing called arise, persist and perish even at conventional level.

Malcolm wrote:

You are simply mistaken about Candrakirti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

dumbbombu said:

gotcha, thanks. so would it be fair to say Dzogchen views all schools favourably then although it perhaps views itself as the pinnacle or ultimate?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen regards all vehicles favorably and perceives itself as the final meaning of all Buddhist, as well as non-Buddhist, teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Namdrol said:

All teachings spring from dzogchen, it is the source of all teachings, and the place to which all teachings return.

N

dumbbombu said:

hi Namdrol, this is an interesting statement. when you say it, are you meaning all Vajrayana teachings, all tantric teachings or all Buddhadharma teachings, period? if the latter, care to elaborate a little in layman's terms? cheers.

Malcolm wrote:

All dharma teachings. All dharma teachings arise from the need to educate people about their real state. That real state is called "Dzogchen". Some teachings are more direct, some are less so, but in the end, that is the state they are all pointing at, whether directly or indirectly.

Of course, dzogchen teachings themselves point to this state in the most direct way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Combining Ayurvedic/Tibetan Medicine and Herbs & Supplements

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Although in reading the thread here about Shilajit, it seems that it might be cooling, which wouldnt be good for Tummo practice; although it was also said that Shilajit could have a warming after-digestion effect.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite the opposite, Shilajatu is very warming.

Pregnant women in general should take no herbs at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: A 1st look: Red Pine's Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra as Jasmine Tea

Content:

Will said:

Could this "book of Indian letters" be some sort of dictionary and he was just back translating from Chinese into Sanskrit, then Tibetan? Why say he then "established it"; why not simply write "he translated it."?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it cannot mean that.

It means that he had an Indian manuscript of the text in front of him. Established here means something like "edited it". Means he translated it and checked it for accuracy.

It is quite likely he had a Chinese version with him as well. Many early sutras translated into Tibetan were translations which triangulated between Sanskrit originals and Chinese translations.

For example, here is another colophon for the 'phags pa legs nyes kyi rgyu dang 'bras bu bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo

zhus chen gyi lo tstsha ba bande chos grub kyis rgya gar dang rgya'i dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa/

The Zhuchen Lotsawa, the monk Chosdrup, translated it from an Indian and an Chinese text, edited it and established it.

Or here from one of the Ratnakuta sutras, the āryāyusmannandagarbhāvākṛāntinirdeśa

lo tstsha ba 'gos chos grub kyis rgya nag gi dpe las bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa

Lotsawa Gos Chosdrup translated from a Chinese book, edited it, and established it.

I will grant you however, it seems that our Lotsawa Gos here is more comfortable with Chinese than Sanskrit. However, given that the Sanskrit was available to Gos at the time, and that he knew it, it seems unlikely he translated the Lanka directly from Chinese.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 10:49 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred Space

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 9:43 AM

Title: Re: A 1st look: Red Pine's Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra as Jasmine Tea

Content:

Will said:

In Porter's defense, he avoided translating the Lanka for many years because he could not understand Gunabhadra's Chinese. It followed the Sanskrit syntax, which makes a profound text many times harder to understand, much less translate into English. The fact that only one other translation has appeared since 1932, suggests it was & is a very hard nut to crack.

Namdrol said:

If you don't know Tibetan or Sanskrit, then yes it could be.

The Tibetan version reads very straightforwardly though.

Will said:

Good for Chos-grub, but he was translating from the Chinese of Gunabhadra, not the Sanskrit - why? - beats me. Also I wrote "Sanskrit syntax", but Porter wrote "Sanskrit word sequence" - if that makes any difference. A later Tibetan version by Anonymous is from the Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

'gos chos grub kyis rgya dpe las bsgyur te gtan la phab pa'o

"Gos Chodrup translated from the Indian text and established it."

rgya dpe - rgya gar gyi yi ge dpe cha,

rgya dpe -- a book of Indian letters

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 8:38 AM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

yadave said:

Hey guys and gals,

Let me know if you don't want to discuss this anymore. In the meantime, are the following statements equivalent in the language of Madhyamaka?

1. X ultimately exists.
2. X inherently exists.
3. X is unconditioned.
4. X is independent.
5. X is not dependently originated.
6. X is not empty.

Regards,

Dave.

Malcolm wrote:

Add to that:

7. X exists

And I would say you have a full deck.

You see, in chapter 15 of MMK Nagarjuna asks, where is there an existent not included in *svabhāva* (inherent existence) or *parabhāva* (dependent existence defined as a stealth version of *svabhāva* in the previous verse)? He then goes on to say that if existents are not established, then non-existents are not established, since a non-existent is normally defined by people as something which existed before, does not exist now. Having set this out, he then says, whoever has a view involving existents, non-existents, inherent existents or dependent existents does not understand Buddha's view. He then cites the Reply to Katyayana, the only sutra cited in the whole of the MML i.e. "The world is bound by a duality, "It is" and "It is not".

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: A 1st look: Red Pine's *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* as Jasmine Tea

Content:

Will said:

In Porter's defense, he avoided translating the Lanka for many years because he could not understand Gunabhadra's Chinese. It followed the Sanskrit syntax, which makes a profound text many times harder to understand, much less translate into English. The fact that only one other translation has appeared since 1932, suggests it was & is a very hard nut to crack.

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't know Tibetan or Sanskrit, then yes it could be.

The Tibetan version reads very straightforwardly though.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: Stranded on a desert island...which 3 books would you want?

Content:

Mr. G said:

Scenario: You're stranded on a desert island and can only have 3 Dzogchen books with you. Which ones would you pick?

Malcolm wrote:

The unwritten tantra

the sgra thal gyur

the rigpa rangshar

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Why do Tulku/reincarnate realized masters

Content:

reg said:

why are these demons or demonic forces or whatever so bent on harming or interfering with others' spiritual practice?

kirtu said:

They are dedicated to evil and want to turn at least our world into a hell realm.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are manifestations of karmic debts that we owe to sentient beings we have knowingly or unknowingly injured.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

Virgo said:

Yes, but no one can protect you from your karma. And when the five poisons increase... you do bad things.

Isn't it true Loppon?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

True.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

wisdom said:

Oh I fully agree in the objective existence of the protectors, and I believe that Virgo had the experience he says he had. I have enough experience with the objective spirit world to know of its power. I guess my question is why does tobacco have this quality, and not any other number of vices? I can smoke pot constantly by this theory, and still be protected, but one cigarette will exempt me from protection. Or if I am a perfect practitioner with perfect conduct, but walk into a bar where people are smoking, all the protectors will abandon me, and I will be left unprotected and unable to be helped? What about walking down the street, am I unprotected every time I walk past a smoker? Or at a bus stop? I guess my question is why do the protectors hate smoke this much, why are they unable to stand its presence?

Malcolm wrote:

Worldly protectors, the once that react to tobacco smoke, don't really live in cities anyway. Too many humans, too much pollution.

Wisdom protectors don't care.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Riwo Sangchod - ingredients question

Content:

ngodrup said:

Who can check Chogyur Linpga's recipe for magnetizing incense for musk?

Malcolm wrote:

Where is it located, send me the page number and I can tell you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 19th, 2012 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Ngondro

Content:

Clarence said:

One day I will have learned enough acronyms to belong to the group of deep knowledge.

Anyway, I think I will order ToC.

gregkavarnos said:

Asking your lama would probably be a good idea too. I was lucky enough to get a transmission of Gendun Rinpoche's advice for Ngondro to three year retreatants . Unbelievable quantity of detail (and quality too), stuff that was neither in the sadhana, nor the ToC. Stuff that you can only get from a lama! Plus when you get it from a lama you also have the opportunity to ask questions regarding details and about stuff that was not said or read.

Malcolm wrote:

TOC is an incomplete translation. All the Sahaja Mahāmudra stuff was left out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

wayland said:

Thanks Namdrol. I found the following on p194 of The Supreme Source by CNN, in the context of not following a gradual path: Training to progress along the levels of realization, one practices the methods for stabilizing the state of calm, however, meditation tending towards perfection is far from the equanimity of the state free of concepts.

Seeking to understand the ultimate nature of existence, one practices the methods of meditation for clarity, however, meditation directed to clarifying something is far from the equanimity of the state free of concepts.

Is this contrasting śamatha and vipaśyāna (as practiced by other schools) with that of the dzogchen path you quoted above?

They seem to be portrayed as a gradualist method in this context.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 11:00 PM
Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness
Content:
DarwidHalim said:
Nagarjuna said there is no arising, there is no duration, there is no cessation.

Malcolm wrote:
He said there is no arising, duration or perishing which can be found on analysis.

But the consequence of this is that there is nothing unconditioned or ultimate which can be found either.

If you can't find a thing, you can't find its nature.

But in terms of conventional truth, Nagarajuna certainly accepted that things arose, persisted, and perished. Just not ultimately so.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 10:26 PM
Title: Re: Smoking tobacco
Content:
Adamantine said:
Do you really think it would have been hard for him to procure cigarettes?

Malcolm wrote:
Snuff and pipe smoking was common enough. But rolled cigarettes? Possible but not too likely in regular supply in Golog.

But perhaps they came in with the brick tea trade.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 10:19 PM
Title: Re: Smoking tobacco
Content:
Lingpupa said:
I could be wrong, of course, but I would be surprised if cigarette smoking was widespread in 19th century Tibet. Snuff, perhaps, again, I don't know, but cigarettes? Do

you think that one is true or just someone re-telling the story of Dudjom Lingpa and grafting it on to Gendun Chopel?

If anything it strikes me as more likely (I must stress again that this is not much more than an educated hunch) that the story might have been first attached to a figure of Gendun Chopel's time and then grafted back to Dudjom Lingpa.

Malcolm wrote:

People did not smoke cigarettes in Tibet during the 19th century. But they did smoke these tiny little pipes.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 18th, 2012 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: robaire on Buddhism & Christianity

Content:

robaire said:

I know enough.

Malcolm wrote:

Not, apparently, about Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: China party official warns members over religion

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Karl Marx talked about the inherent contradictions of capital that give rise to an impoverished proletariat and that the social/historical consequences of this dialectic will be the collapse of capitalism and the institution of a proletarian centred political/economic/social structure.

You are talking about Karl Marx right? Not Groucho, Harpo or Chico Marx? Right???

Or maybe you read the Smith and Keynes translation of his works?

Malcolm wrote:

I think Beatzen is referring to the fact that Marx called capitalism "progressive", and a necessary phase in the historical developments which presage Industrial Socialism.

What Marx was, in fact, was an ideologue of urbanism and industrial civilization.

In terms of Smith, there is in fact very little in Marx that goes beyond Smith's labor theory of wealth. Marx's Capital is essentially a commentary on Wealth of Nations, properly understood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

wayland said:

To what extent are śamatha and vipaśyanā considered important in dzogchen and does dzogchen have its own definitions of them?

Namdrol said:

They are important and yes.

wayland said:

Hi Namdrol,

I'd be interested if you could point me in the direction of any information regarding how dzogchen interprets them. I would assume (perhaps incorrectly) that they are a natural condition within dzogchen, as opposed to a gradualist presentation?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

When one loosely rests vidyā in its own state, after coarse and subtle concepts come to calmly rest on their own, vidyā vividly abides in its own state. That śamatha is called “dwelling in the essence of vidyā”. In that state there is no lethargy or agitation in vidyā. Clarity, pristine lucidity, vividness, nakedness, and limpidity respectively cannot be seen with the eye, cannot be described with words, and cannot be established as a thing. The clarity that is like seeing, the pristine lucidity that is like an experience, the vividness that is like description, the nakedness that is like apprehending a thing, and the limpidity that is like a thought occurs in vidyā in and of itself. That alone is the wisdom of vipaśyāna. Though śamatha and vipaśyāna are given two separate names, in essence there is no difference.

-- Explanatory Tantra of Distinguishing Mind and Vidyā

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

Also, about "obsession with fluids and gender", try telling that to H.H. the Dalai Lama, who is, first and foremost, a Dzogchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

I would be happy to discuss this with HHDL anytime. I have ample proof in the form of texts and so on that his presentation is not properly understood by others.

Anyway Lhugpa, you are not even remotely an expert on this subject. You have received what, a couple of direct introductions, at best from ChNN? Have you ever received a full on major empowerment such as Hevajra, Kalacakra, Guhyagarbha, etc? If you have not, then I would suggest that you are not qualified to have an opinion on this topic, let alone be discussing it.

You are not speaking from the perspective of a practitioner. You have not engaged in creation stage practice, so how can you pretend to have any insight at all into completion stage practices? At least, at the very least, I spent three years in solitary retreat doing these practices.

You are not speaking from the perspective of a translator, nor a scholar. You are speaking from the perspective of an enthusiastic layperson with very inadequate knowledge of the subject.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Anyone Know Anything About This?

Content:

Mr. G said:

Can someone verify they know the owner of this site, or at least confirm this site is fine? There's a lot of personal questions that are asked upon registration.

Malcolm wrote:

I think it was set up by Song Park. He is the first registered user.

I know him pretty well, He is a good guy.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

I think it's interesting that a Dzogchenpa is this adamant about condemning homosexuality on an internet forum. I'd be interested to hear ChNNR's opinion on the matter...

Malcolm wrote:

Lhugpa is a noob (sorry, but its true). I would not call him a Dzogchenpa just yet.

He is working it out. He has a lot of conceptual baggage from non-Buddhsits he stills find authoratative.

He will realize eventually that all this obsession with fluids and gender is a complete waste of time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

Lhug-Pa said:

In regard to all three above-mentioned Lamas now:

"Any reliable sources for your assertion?"

Malcolm wrote:

In the case of the latter, a personal student of Dudjom R-- personal communication verified by a second party.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: How practical is consort practice for the majority?

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

H.E. Garchen Rinpoche and Thrangu Rinpoche are two prominent gurus who support homosexual pairings in traditional Yab Yum practice, as well.

Malcolm wrote:

So did Dujdom R.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Smoking tobacco

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

All of the spiritual side effects aside (blocked channels, breaking of Samaya with protectors, addiction, distress in the Bardo, etc.), I think the bottom line lies in the Four Thoughts. The precious human birth is EXTREMELY hard to attain. Why would you EVER participate in a practice that is proven to destroy it, without any kind of tangible benefit whatsoever?

Namdrol said:

Catmoon is not a Nyingmapa, and so I don't think these dire warnings, which are from a Nyingma perspective, have much influence.

gregkavarnos said:

The four thoughts are a Nyingmapa thing??? We go through them before every single practice in the Karma Kagyu lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I meant all the terma warnings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Role of śamatha and vipaśyanā in dzogchen?

Content:

wayland said:

To what extent are śamatha and vipaśyanā considered important in dzogchen and does dzogchen have its own definitions of them?

Malcolm wrote:

They are important and yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

PadmaVonSamba said:

How many is in a lapse of memory?

Malcolm wrote:

Forever.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Misunderstanding emptiness

Content:

DarwidHalim said:

Which Buddhist text that explain the duration of thought is 13 milliseconds?

Malcolm wrote:

The Abhidharmakosha among others.

A kṣanas is the most fundamental unit of time in Buddhism. The duration of a kṣanas is the duration of a thought. So if you do the math:

120 kṣanas equals on tatkṣana; 60 tatkṣanas equal a lava; 30 lava equal a muhurta; 30 muhurtas equal an ahorata, which is a single 24 hour period of time. So, according to Buddhist principles then, a moment of thought has a duration of 0.0013 seconds.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 17th, 2012 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: Western Buddhists, modernity and the European enlightenment

Content:

Beatzen said:

Give it a couple hundred years. Some western yogis will develop novel approaches to dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

No need. We have what we need.