

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Caz said:

As you say there where problems on E-sangha because of this and many other issues because it claimed to be an open and non sectarian forum and yet posters where expected to maintain standards that where not exactly always what you would expect from the front label, So again with ordination ones own personal opinions have to be overcome in order that the same flaw be not repeated.

Malcolm wrote:

The initial problem came in this way -- people claiming to be monks (Zen priests) who were married, had kids, drank and held jobs, as well as some people posing as Lama "so and so" with no credentials.

The majority of people at the E-sangha team, including but not limited too, the several bhikshus from three distinct monastic lineages (Theravada, Chinese and Tibetan) we had on staff at the time, thought that this idea of a monk or lama was not correct.

We observed many beginners being very confused. So we tried to help by creating a protocol for properly identifying monastics as opposed to "alternate" ordinations and lay teachers. but it didn't work in the end.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: A Garland of Jewels by Jamgon Mipham

Content:

Will said:

Nirvanavishakhambin says Namdrol - close, a tad off. The book says Sarvanivaranavishkambhin meaning "complete remover of all obstacles." This is the one I have the most trouble remembering.

In the selection about this bodhisattva, another very impressive and powerful one is mentioned, the sister of a tathagata, Dispeller of Obstacles. Her Sanskrit original is not given.

Malcolm wrote:

Type -- often his name is given sans sarva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:
muni said:
Why is it inexpressible? Because one falls in nihilism?

Malcolm wrote:
Because ontological predicates of phenomena are all erroneous.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:41 PM
Title: Re: Non duality.
Content:
muni said:
There is no slipping in correct understanding! There is no possibility to understand Dzogchen when we see it as wrong. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rigpa> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;
<http://www.theawakenedeye.com/view.htm> " onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; just two websites I clicked on.

Malcolm wrote:
Right, there is a certain trend in Dzogchen tantras which regard these definitions as incomplete, and which warn that without supplementary understandings, a practitioner can err into cessation since the extreme of clarity is cessation.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:34 PM
Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?
Content:
Namdrol said:
Well, since you have convinced yourself, far be it from me to condition you otherwise.

Mariusz said:
By saying "wishful" I meant just practice according to one's own master of Dzogchen, without be "conditioned" for instant or for gradual. Is your "instant" or "outside 9 yanas" helpful for your practice in your daily life?

Malcolm wrote:
It is based on personal experience. If you have it, then you have it. And if you don't, you don't. There is no point in arguing about it or speculating.

There is a Dzogchen path that is not gradual, and is outside of the nine yānas, as hard as it may seem to be able to understand this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: A Garland of Jewels by Jamgon Mipham

Content:

plwk said:

Mahastamaprapta doesn't seem to be on the list of the 'asta maha bodhisattvas' or 'asta utaputras' and Maitreya is instead listed... see
http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Eight_great_bodhisattvas and
http://www.khandro.net/deities_bodhisattvas.htm

I recall in many past Mahayana ES threads that Mahastamaprapta is the peaceful form of Vajrapani...

Malcolm wrote:

Interestingly, Samantabhadra is definitely considered to be a peaceful form of Vajrapani.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Non-duality is very boring and easily becomes a deviation.

muni said:

Very boring.

Student: Rinpoche, is buddha nature an actualization of nonduality?

Dzongzar Khyentse Rinpoche: Yes. They are same thing. Exactly same thing. Very good question.

Silent Bob said:

Namdrol, your assertion is puzzling to say the least, and one which is at odds with my own experience. With all due respect, sir, I just don't get it.

Chris

Malcolm wrote:

According to the dzogchen tantras, a non-dual equipoise can easily lead to a deviation into a non-buddhist nihilistic view since there is a possibility of slipping into a meditative absorption of cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

Namdrol,

Yes, I can agree with that. But it's still not like a living being's evolution as certain teachings can not just go extinct but resurrect too, not to mention cases when one teaching is integrated into another and thus lives on as part of a bigger organism from which later it can break off. So much for applying biology to Buddhism. Whether dependent origination is what to be identified as the core, well, if that equals for instance the "tolerance of no-birth", "seeing the nature" and "unity of samsara and nirvana" than sure.

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent origination is exactly the meaning of non-arising -- Manjushri states in PP sutras "Whatever arises dependently, just that does not arise in truth."

"Whoever sees the Dharma, sees dependent origination; whoever sees dependent origination, see the Dharma". etc.

It is only through dependent origination that we can come to an unerring understanding of emptiness, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: A Garland of Jewels by Jamgon Mipham

Content:

plwk said:

Mahastamaprabhata doesn't seem to be on the list of the 'astamaha bodhisattvas' or 'astamahaputras'... see

http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Eight_great_bodhisattvas and

http://www.khandro.net/deities_bodhisattvas.htm

I recall in many past Mahayana ES threads that Mahastamaprabhata is the peaceful form of Vajrapani...

Malcolm wrote:

You are right, Maitreya -- damn I get a D. Not because I got seven right, but because I got one wrong. (you are slipping, Namdrol).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Caz said:

Depends what your Idea of authentic is, Generally speaking I think if someone turns up claiming to be ordained and has in reality never been bestowed ordination from an order but is self proclaimed ordained then it would not be good to recognise a person as such. And then we get on to the issue of personal judgment a few western orders do not ordain people according to the full vinaya but these people are still ordained and as everyone who takes these vows seriously tries to live by them to the best of their ability...So long as one doesn't operate their own personal prejudice as to whom is keeping morale discipline then there shouldn't be a problem.

Namdrol said:

Right, that was where the problem began at e-sangha. We would ask, people would get offended, etc. Then, in trying to establish international standards of ordination we ran into issues, such as Zen priests demanded to be treated and considered exactly the same as fully ordained bhikshus and so on. Our basic policy became that if you are not a shramana or bhiksu, you are not a member of the monastic sangha. You could be considered "ordained", but not as a monk. We drew a strong distinction, and a valid one at that, between lay "ordinations" and monastic ordinations.

This was what led to the Zen debacle at e-sangha. It caused many other problems as well.

Caz said:

Well I wouldn't see there being an issue as far as recognising someone as ordained if one wishes to say they are a monk when following more or less vows, then there is no problem in my opinion as monk or nun in the classical western sense is easily applicable to those whom don't follow the full vinaya...There are not many these days who can remember the full ordination vows let alone keep them all, It is far better in my opinion to have morale discipline codes that are keepable and provide the much needed foundation of mind training. Extensive or condensed it matter not so long as good conduct is kept for focusing the mind.

Perhaps it should just be common courtesy to treat anyone who abides by morale discipline with respect regardless of what one's views are on how many vows there should or should not be after all the basis of friendship is having a respect for one and other.

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of the spirit of the thing, perhaps -- but standards must be maintained. There are many people who are capable of upholding their vows -- so it is not impossible. Since there are such people, I think it is important their discipline be recognized and honored -- and it is not honored by allowing just anyone to call

themselves or demand they themselves be treated as a fully ordained person just because they wish to have that status. People you are talking about won't care one way or another what they are called. But Bhikshus are the ambassadors of Shakyamuni Buddha. When his monastic sangha disappears, his dharma will be on the verge of collapsing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

The word "beyond" in the context of affirmation seems to be the pillar of all these ideas. A pillar that is a mere concept itself.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, reality is inexpressible. Now we can all go home.

But your sabbasutta citation is not relevant. Why? Because nirvana, the supreme dharma, part of the dharmadhatu, is an object of the mano-dhatu.

This is why the Buddha states "Monks, there is an unborn, etc..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: A Garland of Jewels by Jamgon Mipham

Content:

Will said:

In 2008 this book of 333 pages was translated by Yeshe Gyamtso and published by KTD Pubs. The subtitle The Eight Great Bodhisattvas tells all. Mipham spends almost half the book quoting from sutras inspiring passages about the vows & teachings of Manjushri. The other seven members of the Arya Sangha are given around 20 to 40 pages of sutra quotes each.

Can you name them all; without looking them up? Avalokita is one... who else?

Malcolm wrote:

Manjushri, Avalokiteshvara, Vajrapani, Samantabhadra, Ksitigarbha, Akashagarbha, Nirvanavishakhambin, Mahasthamaprapta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

Caz said:

Depends what your Idea of authentic is, Generally speaking I think if someone turns up claiming to be ordained and has in reality never been bestowed ordination from an order but is self proclaimed ordained then it would not be good to recognise a person as such. And then we get on to the issue of personal judgment a few western orders do not ordain people according to the full vinaya but these people are still ordained and as everyone who takes these vows seriously tries to live by them to the best of their ability...So long as one doesn't operate their own personal prejudice as to whom is keeping moral discipline then there shouldn't be a problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, that was where the problem began at e-sangha. We would ask, people would get offended, etc. Then, in trying to establish international standards of ordination we ran into issues, such as Zen priests demanded to be treated and considered exactly the same as fully ordained bhikkhus and so on. Our basic policy became that if you are not a shramana or bhikkhu, you are not a member of the monastic sangha. You could be considered "ordained", but not as a monk. We drew a strong distinction, and a valid one at that, between lay "ordinations" and monastic ordinations.

This was what led to the Zen debacle at e-sangha. It caused many other problems as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

To add another view, it is not evolving I believe in but simply adapting (related terms nonetheless).

Malcolm wrote:

I think evolution is more appropriate. There is a core DNA, if you will, dependent origination, that makes all these speciations of Dharma related to one another. But some forms of dharma continue to evolve, others are on the verge of extinction, or are functionally extinct (i.e. Huayan, etc.), and so on., and some are simply better adapted to survive in the modern world than others.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Mariusz said:

Yes. For instant realization one has to be instant realizer. Who are instant realizers in Buddhism these days? Are you ready for the mind direct Dzogchen transmission of the buddhas (Tib. gyalwa gong gyü; Wyl. rgyal ba dgongs brgyud) from the dharmakaya Samantabhadra or the sign Dzogchen transmission of the vidyadharas (Tib. rigdzin da gyü; Wyl. rig 'dzin brda brgyud) from Vajrasattva in this very instant, here and now. So called Dzogchen outside all 9 yanas is wishful only.

Moreover, the thinking on Gradual or Instant is the matter not only Dzogchen in Buddhism. Even Yogacara agrees it is possible, when instant realization "beyond all reference points" outside the Mind - so called mental non-engagement, let alone Mahamudra HYT realization of Clear Light "outside" any effort, and so on. These all are the buddhist wishes only, whatever Dzogchen or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, since you have convinced yourself, far be it from me to condition you otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

heart said:

I am sure that is correct. Maybe you can define the view beyond the nine vehicles but how can you define the Dzogchenpa beyond the nine yanas?

Malcolm wrote:

The texts of the utterly secret unsurpassed great perfection place itself outside the nine yānas.

heart said:

As you yourself said before they all take refuge, arouse bodhicitta and practice various yidams and so on. Almost all Dzogchen cycles also contain various Tantric practices and Mahayana attitudes.

Malcolm wrote:

For people of the best fortune with intermediate capacity -- who need an anuyoga approach.

heart said:

This goes for the Nyingthik and Yangtik and so on also. Something that believes itself to be independent and free from the "conceited vehicles of the nine yanas" should not lean so heavily on those vehicles.

Malcolm wrote:

The utterly secret unsurpassed cycle does not. It does not make use of them at all.

heart said:

Like the Kunjed Gyalpo, it is a Dzogchen Tantra pointing out the ultimate view of Dzogchen for the practitioners of the lower yanas, in particular the Mahayoga and Anuyoga, so it is solidly within the tradition of the nine yanas.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed, it is not part of the utterly secret unsurpassed cycle. However, if you understand the meaning of the utterly secret unsurpassed cycle then it opens up the meaning of texts like Kun byed rgyal po causing them to be read differently. Just as, for example, sems sde allows one to read tantras like the Manjushrinamasamgiti differently.

heart said:

Or else all these people like Jax and Sönam that reads the Kunjed Gyalpo as basically a good reason to consider the nine yanas as unimportant and unnecessary are correct.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not an "either or" thing. It is a question of good fortune and past accumulations. That's it. Anyway, I agree with you that for the most part, no one is free from a mind and a dualistic vision. Therefore, we have the nine yānas to address this condition, depending on practitioner and capacity. But also, as you know very well, the real practice of Dzogchen has nothing to do with mind, and therefore, nothing to do with the nine yānas.

The true practice of Dzogchen is based on wisdom. The nine yānas is based on mind. That is the basic difference.

This is not my idea, magnus. This is what is explained in many Dzogchen texts and upadeshas. Moreover, this is also explained by our mutual master, Norbu Rinpoche. It may be hard to understand, but it is true. There is a Dzogchen practice that is not part of the nine yānas approach. Norbu Rinpoche has dedicated his life to explaining this properly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Namdrol said:

We can speculate all we like.

But there are some salient points to bear in mind. It was not imagined by Mahāyānists that there were persistent oral lineages of Mahāyāna teachings in Jambudvīpa.

Quite the contrary. Mahāyāna is the original treasure tradition. Mahāyānists came to believe that their texts had been laid away for four centuries or more and then revealed by such masters as Nāgārjuna and so on, kept by Bodhisattvas such as Mañjuśrī for safe keeping until the time was right for them again to be promulgated. Therefore, any honest person whose mind is not clouded by the delusion of religious zeal and fervor has to admit that it is unlikely that the detailed and highly complex literary compositions which we now know as Mahāyāna sūtras could not possibly have been composed in any thing other than a visionary manner at a much later time than their purported setting. Moreover, they would have to admit that these detailed literary compositions, (even as early as the Dīgha Nikāya), betray evidence of extensive editing and development over many centuries, as is proven by the layers of such texts in Chinese translation. For example, the Maitreya Chapter, so important to gzhan stong exegesis, is completely missing in Chinese sources, proving that it was a Yogacara addition to the PP corpus.

Pema Rigdzin said:

You make a good case, and what you say is probably the most likely explanation. Since we've already established that these texts' provenance is beside the point (aside from the enlightened nature of that source), my continued participation here is just for the sake of it being interesting to me and because I may learn new things as I continue to probe.

With that in mind... It was my understanding that the PP sutras were rediscovered by Nagarjuna, and Maitreya's five treatises were kind of like pure vision teachings received by Asanga, etc., but are all of the Mahayana sutras said to have come to us in a similar way? Were none said to have come to us in a long lineage from the Buddha (a la kama)? If there are cases where a "kama" lineage of certain Mahayana sutras is claimed traditionally, is it not possible that the historical teachings spoken of in these sutras did in fact take place, were faithfully transcribed and hidden, and later edited and added to throughout the centuries following their rediscovery? Again, I acknowledge that it really doesn't matter, but I am curious.

Malcolm wrote:

It is highly unlikely.

No Pali suttas of which I am aware are so highly self-referential, making constant references to worshipping themselves in book form, or constant references to the doctrine they contain, or defensive remarks about criticizing their contents. In other words, the Agamas and Nikayas seem to lack any anxiety at all; whereas Mahāyāna sūtras seem to be filled with anxious polemics about their authenticity.

This anxiety that is so noticeable in early Mahāyāna texts begins to vanish when India authors, copying a strategy of the Theravada Abhidhamma pitika authors, hit on the strategy of ultimately siting the original source of Mahāyāna sūtras in the person of Tathāgata Vairocana in Akaniṣṭha Gandavyuha.

Now freed from the spatio-temporal constraints of Kapilavastu, Rajagriha, etc., and utilizing docetic strategies of transmission (the three kāyas), these texts were now immune to hermeneutical critiques of authenticity based on their composition as texts ultimately voiced by Shakyamuni located within the lifetime and career of Shakyamuni. Shakyamuni's role, in India, as the proponent of Mahāyāna was subordinated to that of Vairocana. Shakyamuni-as-nirmanakāya now appears more as a shepherd of the Dharma, rather than its ultimate source. There are many other threads one can work out from this basic premise.

This did not happen without some dissenting backlash, of course i.e. the Saddharmapundarika can be seen as a reaction to this firm trend, with the ultimate result that in India the Saddharmapundarika was completely sidelined since it did not fit into the innovative Yogacara docetic model of sūtra transmission with the sambhogakāya acting as an intermediary between the dharmakāya and the nirmanakāya.

Yogacara doceticism is a vital key also in the composition and dissemination of Vajrayana. Now, freed utterly from the dictates of the career of Gautama, Buddhist authors/mystics could fearlessly compose tantras free of concern about their historicity. The only evidence of anxiety in the tantras is that they would fall into improper hands.

The Agamas, Vaipulya-sūtras, and tantras should be seen as a successive record of the religious experiences of people who attained awakening in some measure, starting with The Buddha. When the main themes of Indian compositional strategies in Mahāyāna had been set down, these themes adopted to compose original sūtras in Chinese, Tibetan, Khotanese, etc. These themes of composition were so strong, so compelling, that even nominally non-buddhist peoples such as Bonpos adopted them hook, line and sinker, developing a religion in Tibet that is virtually indistinguishable from Tibetan Buddhism other than details of narrative origin, and used these narrative strategies to express their own spiritual evolution.

I am a firm believer in evolution. I personally think that Buddhism is a religion that underwent and is undergoing significant evolution, reaching its high point in the teachings of the great perfection, and adapting itself to various cultures in an evolutionary manner according to the environment in which it found itself.

The reason Buddhism was able to undergo this evolution without its core being destroyed, but rather revealed and expressed with greater and greater clarity as successive generations of buddhas refined its essential message, is that the essence of the dharma is dependent origination.

Ok, said enough, now have to get back to work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Ordination

Content:

plwk said:

Inspired by the sister site... <http://dhammawheel.com/viewforum.php?f=30> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

I should think that by now, having been here from its days of infancy, under two profiles (the other one given a funeral) until now, Dharma Wheel perhaps has attained some sort of maturity (I believe we do have Ordained members in here) to have a forum of its own on Ordination.

If not mistaken, when Ordination comes to mind in the Mahayana/Vajrayana contexts, one is looking at:

- a. the monastic and non-monastic systems (Dharmagupta/Mulasarvastivada and Bodhisattva/Tantric Vows/Precepts)
- b. the East Asian Mahayana and its affiliates, the Japanese and its affiliates, the Tibetan Vajrayana and its affiliates

Then, this Forum should be an avenue to discuss and exchange ideas on:

- a. Ordination
 - i. General discussions (typical Q&As, specifics on robes, fake monastics, customs/protocol of the Ordained and etc)
 - ii. The Experiential (from the fully Ordained to those who participated in short term monastic retreats and those who disrobed)
 - iii. Legal/Administrative issues (e.g when ordaining in a foreign country or when foreigners ordain in one's country)

- b. Resources on Ordination

What do you think Admin/Mods/Members?

The above suggestions are not exhaustive and ideas are welcomed to improve and enhance further.

Malcolm wrote:

One of the main causes of people thinking we were fascists at e-sangha was when we tried to impose some order in validating who was actually ordained and who was not.

Sooner or later some clown who is not actually an authentic lama/monk/ etc. will show up here and it will cause problems.

Having an ordained forum will create this problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 11:08 AM

Title: Re: Open Webcast with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu: Mandarava

Content:

Jikan said:

Oh, because it's already tomorrow in Singapore. Because the world is round or something.

thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

I should have updated....tonight rinpoche's is giving a formal empowerment -- these cannot be webcast since it is a different type of transmission. Requires in person attendance.

However, the open retreat resumes tomorrow night.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:37 AM

Title: Re: Ego cosmic energy

Content:

Jikan said:

I certainly don't disagree there, Namdrol.

I just think we'd be better at the whole Buddhist thing if we avoided going into group ridicule mode when a stranger from out of town walks into the room. And I mean this as a self-criticism first and foremost.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but ram seems pretty unfazed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

Pema Rigdzin,

What you mean is the Yogacara teaching of the five gotras, and it is not relevant to the question here.

Namdrol,

Yes, there were some Hinayana schools, the Mahasamghikas for instance, who had some concept of other buddhas. So maybe this problem never occurred in India or anywhere else. Still, in the agamas/nikayas there is no sign of other buddhas and those are the texts said to be preached for the sravakas. Consequently, since in the Mahayana sutras sravakas are also present, they should have known about other buddhas.

Pema Rigdzin said:

Haha sorry, what I wrote about the five gotras was just the set-up to my main point which I obviously forgot to make... however, now in light of my reflection upon what Namdrol has suggested, I have to rethink the point I was going to make. Maybe he's right, which doesn't matter because as he mentioned, the liberating power of the Mahayana sutras is in their Dharma, not their supposed historicity. But I'd like to look further into this for myself, and hopefully it'll be stimulating convo for others as well. So, before I abandon the possibility that the Mahayana sutras did indeed literally fall off the lips of the Buddha himself as we're lead to believe, I'll start with this question:

First, I'm assuming those Arhats in attendance during the Buddha's supposedly historical Mahayana teachings conceived the mind for enlightenment. Might not they have nonetheless recognized that some future beings would also have an affinity for the Bodhisattva vehicle, while others would only be attracted to the individual liberation vehicle? If that were the case, wouldn't they have been selective in who they passed either vehicle on to once they began to teach after the Buddha's death? Then, accordingly, wouldn't two different narratives and Dharmas have developed over the hundreds of subsequent years before it was decided to commit the Buddha's teachings to writing? And by that time, wouldn't one lineage have maintained their Mahayana focus while appreciating the upaya of having two different paths for beings of two different affinities, while another lineage would have held only to the authenticity of the Shravaka approach, committing to writing only the teachings they viewed as authentic and pertinent to their goal?

Malcolm wrote:

We can speculate all we like.

But there are some salient points to bear in mind. It was not imagined by Mahāyānists that there were persistent oral lineages of Mahāyāna teachings in Jambudvīpa.

Quite the contrary. Mahāyāna is the original treasure tradition. Mahāyānists came to believe that their texts had been laid away for four centuries or more and then revealed by such masters as Nāgārjuna and so on, kept by Bodhisattvas such as Mañjuśrī for safe keeping until the time was right for them again to be promulgated. Therefore, any honest person whose mind is not clouded by the delusion of religious zeal and fervor has to admit that it is unlikely that the detailed and highly complex literary compositions which we now know as Mahāyāna sūtras could not possibly have been composed in any

thing other than a visionary manner at a much later time than their purported setting. Moreover, they would have to admit that these detailed literary compositions, (even as early as the Dīgha Nikāya), betray evidence of extensive editing and development over many centuries, as is proven by the layers of such texts in Chinese translation. For example, the Maitreya Chapter, so important to gzhan stong exegesis, is completely missing in Chinese sources, proving that it was a Yogacara addition to the PP corpus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

Namdrol,

Sure, and that is exactly the historical point. But since, just as you said, Mahayana followers in the past (and present) think that the sutras were spoken directly by the Buddha, thus I was wondering whether there is an explanation from their side on the lack of other buddhas in the agamas. Although it is possible there isn't such an answer.

Anders Honore said:

Isn't it obvious? Th Mahayana sutras reveal things that weren't spoken in the agamas, either because it wasn't needed for the time or because it is not suitable for the Hinayana. Standard explanation for any addition the Mahayana sutras make to early Buddhism really.

Malcolm wrote:

Astus' question is different -- why did those named Shravakas not know about these other Buddhas since they are present in both Nikaya and Mahayana settings?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Ego cosmic energy

Content:

Jikan said:

Hi Ram,

I don't know the answer to the questions you pose. I don't know if the answers are necessarily related, or are discontinuous.

I don't know if everyone piling on in mocking these questions is a particularly helpful tactic either.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to admit, his initial post was pretty hilarious, even if unintended.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Unknown said:

Of course you can think and label descriptions of the ultimate truth as you wish, but that doesn't make the ultimate truth a "mere fiction".

Views and other conceptual ideas about the ultimate truth are conventional but this has no impact whatsoever on the ultimate truth.

Malcolm wrote:

TM is a little right, and a little wrong.

On the one hand, in absence of the cognition that is undeluded regarding the nature of its object, ultimate truth is a complete fiction, being a mere conceptual contrivance.

He is a little wrong, assuming such undeluded cognitions are possible: when one is directly experiencing such an undeluded cognition regarding the nature of its object, that is an ultimate truth of the unmediated or non-enumerated type.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Ornament of Reason

Content:

Will said:

This is a new translation, from Snow Lion, of Nagarjuna's Root of the Middle Way with an extensive (over 500pp) commentary by Mabja Jangchub Tsondru (d. 1185). The main translator is Thomas Doctor, part of the Dharmachakra Translation Committee. The root text stands alone, and later each verse or line is commented on.

I am only 100pp or so into it, so these first impressions may change. It is an excellent, very clear and helpful commentary. Mabja's detailed outline is included, but not displayed in the usual indented lines, with italics and oodles of 2.2.A.b.x stuff. The outline has little boxes with text connected by lines; sounds primitive, but much easier to use.

The only small quibbles I have are the translation of almost every term. This would be fine if there were a glossary or the index had the Sanskrit equivalent next to the translated word - but neither is in this book. When mentioning some old Indian schools - Enumerators is probably the Sankhya school and the Ritualists is Mimamsa, but "Far Throwers" ???

Another question that is not answered in the book is more biographical info on Mabja bodhisattva. Maybe there is little or none, but considering his detailed, precise, scholarly and wise comments (plus relying on Chandrakirti) leads me to guess Sakya roots for him.

Anyone else started reading it?

Namdrol said:

Not really a Sakya pa. He was scholar at Sangphu, a contemporary of Sonam Tsemo, probably knew him well. Died 1185.

"Far throwers" means Carvaka/lokyati, i.e. materialists who deny rebirth and ripening of karma.

We know virtually nothing about him apart from the fact that he was in the immediate circles of Patsab, the main translator of Candrakirti's material into Tibetan.

Will said:

So maybe he was part of the original Kadam school? No Geluks for 200 years or so. Or maybe Sangphu was a non-attached or independent sort of monastery or center?

Malcolm wrote:

Sangphu was an original Kadampa school that became politically allied with Sakya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Ornament of Reason

Content:

Will said:

This is a new translation, from Snow Lion, of Nagarjuna's Root of the Middle Way with an extensive (over 500pp) commentary by Mabja Jangchub Tsondu (d. 1185). The main translator is Thomas Doctor, part of the Dharmachakra Translation Committee. The root text stands alone, and later each verse or line is commented on.

I am only 100pp or so into it, so these first impressions may change. It is an excellent, very clear and helpful commentary. Mabja's detailed outline is included, but not displayed in the usual indented lines, with italics and oodles of 2.2.A.b.x stuff. The outline has little boxes with text connected by lines; sounds primitive, but much easier to use.

The only small quibbles I have are the translation of almost every term. This would be fine if there were a glossary or the index had the Sanskrit equivalent next to the translated word - but neither is in this book. When mentioning some old Indian schools - Enumerators is probably the Sankhya school and the Ritualists is Mimamsa, but "Far Throwers" ???

Another question that is not answered in the book is more biographical info on Mabja bodhisattva. Maybe there is little or none, but considering his detailed, precise, scholarly and wise comments (plus relying on Chandrakirti) leads me to guess Sakya roots for him.

Anyone else started reading it?

Malcolm wrote:

Not really a Sakya pa. He was scholar at Sangphu, a contemporary of Sonam Tsemo, probably knew him well. Died 1185.

"Far throwers" means Carvaka/lokeyati, i.e. materialists who deny rebirth and ripening of karma.

We know virtually nothing about him apart from the fact that he was in the immediate circles of Patsab, the main translator of Candrakirti's material into Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Tatsuo said:

Couldn't the passage of the Lotus Sutra about the lifespan of Shakyamuni be also valid for the view, that many Buddhas exist in the universe (and therefore the guidance by a Buddha is always available)?

"Good men, the Thus Come One observes how among living beings there are those who delight in a little Law, meager in virtue and heavy with defilement. For such persons I describe how in my youth I left my household and attained anuttara-samyak-sambodhi. But in truth the time since I attained Buddhahood is extremely long, as I have told you. It is simply that I use this expedient means to teach and convert living beings and cause them to enter the Buddha way. That is why I speak in this manner. (...) Why do I do this? Because if the Buddha remains in the world for a long time, those persons with shallow virtue will fail to plant good roots but, living in poverty and lowliness, will become attached to the five desires and be caught in the net of deluded thoughts and imaginings. If they see that the Thus Come One is constantly in the world and never enters extinction, they will grow arrogant and selfish, or become discouraged and neglectful. They will fail to realize how difficult it is to encounter the Buddha and will not approach him with a respectful and reverent mind."

(Lotus Sutra, chapter 14)

Malcolm wrote:

Well, at the risk of a citation war....The Vajracchedika sūtra states:

Those who by my form did see me,
And those who followed me by voice

Wrong the efforts they engaged in,
Me those people will not see.

From the Dharma should one see the Buddhas,
From the Dharmabodies comes their guidance.
Yet Dharma's true nature cannot be discerned,
And no one can be conscious of it as an object.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

]

Rael said:

hey ..i think i'm going to get one of these for me wife to give me more spare time for you guys

Malcolm wrote:

My sentence would have been clearer had i written:

"In other words, from a Madhyamaka perspective all cognitions of relative truths are deluded even if they are conventionally true."[/quote]

I lied, a little bit.

I dropped out of school when I was 15, more or less.

But I did two years of non-credit coursework at Harvard Extension (night school) between 1986-1988, focusing on writing, history and religion. I then rejected pursuit of more academic Buddhist education because I wanted a more traditional approach.

This is what I meant by "adult improvement". I was 24 when I took these courses.

Now, of course, I am an acharya and a doctor of Tibetan Medicine -- all in all about 11 years of work all together. 6 Years of Buddhist education including a three year retreat, five years of education to obtain my degree in Tibetan medicine. I have been studying Buddhism now in one way or another for 25 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Rael said:
so like your saying basically cognating is a Samsaric event...

Namdrol said:
Yes, basically, that is what Nagarjuna, etc. is saying.

Rael said:
thanksif you knew how many times i had to read what you wrote in order to post that....

and you only like me have a grade nine education...

well you have done well....

i appreciate your form Namdrol...it forces me to use me noodle....

and you were right....it's no excuse i should try harder.....

if you only knew how many times in each sentence Google Chrome corrects stuff for me....

hey ..i think i'm going to get one of these for me wife to give me more spare time for you guys

Malcolm wrote:
My sentence would have been clearer had i written:

"In other words, from a Madhyamaka perspective all cognitions of relative truths are deluded even if they are conventionally true."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 12:26 AM
Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:
Rael said:
so like your saying basically cognating is a Samsaric event...

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, basically, that is what Nagarjuna, etc. is saying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists

Content:

Rael said:

But...does that mean we are to shut down knowledge of other systems...explore the beauty of the human spirit.....

Nangwa said:

Not at all.

Buddhism has a long history of investigating and analyzing other traditions in a meaningful way.

Usually of course asserting eventually that Buddhism is "the best" but that's to be expected from Buddhist scholar-monks.

Malcolm wrote:

Meaningful to Buddhists at any rate -- I don't think Hindus feel well represented by Buddhist tenet system literature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: The Medicinal Value of Incense

Content:

Kyosan said:

I'm concerned that frequent burning of incense may increase the risk of cancer. They say that the combustion produces carcinogens.

<http://web.bsu.edu/IEN/archives/110306.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

The main point is to fill the room with fragrance, if you are offering incense devotionally. Therefore, I recommend you use an aromatherapy nebulizer.

You can then procure pure sandalwood essential oil, or agarwood, etc., add a couple drops to your nebulizer, and enjoy the benefits of the aroma and none of the downsides. You could even experiment with creating blends of essential oils for your needs.

A nebulizer works by creating water vapor via ultrasound.

Keep in mind that burning wood for fires, etc, also produce the same compounds. As

well as cars, city traffic, etc.

As long as your house is well ventilated, you use vetted pure incenses from a reliable sources that uses no accelerants, etc., then I think then there is no additional risk to your children that is not already present from our toxic industrial environment as a whole.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

"Well, what sort of text critical conclusion can you draw from that, Astus?"

I'm not looking for text critical conclusions, for that there are some fine scholarly works like "The concept of the Buddha: its evolution from early Buddhism to the trikāya theory" by Guang Xing. Also it's possible to go for a conspiracy theory that the sravakas deleted all the other buddhas but that's just non-sense to me. That's why I'm looking for another perspective on this. Of course, there's always the option to say that buddhas are upaya and such, but that doesn't answer a few things.

Malcolm wrote:

Well how about the obvious answer? The Mahāyāna sutras were written after the Agamas. That answers all questions concerning why this is nor present in that, etc

I understand that there are some people who wish to dearly maintain a death grip on the idea that Mahāyāna sutras are literally, historically, the words of one Gautama Buddha physically uttered sometime between his awakening at 35 and his passing at age 80 -- but that is just religion, that is not Dharma. Dharma lies in the truth of the words, not the mise en scène.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Story of a Vajra Guru mantra siddha

Content:

narraboth said:

well, if it's what happened on him, then it is.

Some Bonpos are against guru rinpoche and ofcourse that's not good.

Namdrol said:

From their point of view, there were two Padmasambhavas; a nice one and one, a an evil

Nepalese sorcerer, that persecuted Bonpos. They just think Nyingmas are confused about history.

dzoki said:

Interesting I thought that this was actually a gelug story of Padmasamabhava which was made up by a certain "scholar" who criticized both terma and kama traditions. So it seems that he was not so original after all, he just borrowed from bonpos.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

Pema Rigdzin,

What you mean is the Yogacara teaching of the five gotras, and it is not relevant to the question here.

Namdrol,

Yes, there were some Hinayana schools, the Mahasamghikas for instance, who had some concept of other buddhas. So maybe this problem never occurred in India or anywhere else. Still, in the agamas/nikayas there is no sign of other buddhas and those are the texts said to be preached for the sravakas. Consequently, since in the Mahayana sutras sravakas are also present, they should have known about other buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, what sort of text critical conclusion can you draw from that, Astus?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Non duality.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Non-duality is very boring and easily becomes a deviation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So, for example, if an undeluded cognition comes to the conclusion that black is white then that means it is an ultimate truth?

Malcolm wrote:

Candra defines two natures for every object, one relative, one ultimate. Undeluded cognitions are predicted on seeing the ultimate nature of a given object.

Black and white are relative aspects.

In other words, all cognitions of relative truths, even if conventionally true, are, from a Madhyamaka perspective, deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Story of a Vajra Guru mantra siddha

Content:

narraboth said:

well, if it's what happened on him, then it is.

Some Bonpos are against guru rinpoche and ofcourse that's not good.

Malcolm wrote:

From their point of view, there were two Padmasambhavas; a nice one and one, a an evil Nepalese sorcerer, that persecuted Bonpos. They just think Nyingmas are confused about history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: Other Buddhas

Content:

Astus said:

What is the traditional explanation for the lack of other buddhas in the agamas? It doesn't seem valid to say that teaching about other buddhas is only a bodhisattva matter since in Mahayana texts it is all fine for sravakas to learn about them and even to aspire for other buddha-realms. So why are there no other buddhas mentioned in the Hinayana teachings, only some buddhas of the past and the next future buddha? Again, it is not the modern historical explanation what I'm looking for here but the addressing of it from a traditional Mahayana perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

There is an argument in the Katavattu where some other nikaya Buddhists assert Buddhas in other world systems. This rejected, saying that if there were such Buddhas, one should know their names and so on.

So speculations about other Buddhas in other worlds was an early feature of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Ego cosmic energy

Content:

ram peswani said:

WHY, WHY ,WHY?

Why does dragon girl turns into MALE before becoming Buddha?

Namdrol said:

Why does the goddess of the Ganges turn Shariputra into woman?

Why Purna has only Male members in the universe which he will rule in future?

Imagine, a universe full of penises.

Why does Guatam Buddha bestow prophesy of Buddhahood to Male members only?

Obviously, it is because only penises can become buddhas.

ram peswani said:

NO PENISES ONLY UNISEX , NO GENDER FAVOURITISM

Bible says Adam created EVE from one of his ribs as a playmate

Unisex male (pure ego) created penis male and @\$% female

And they create so many emotions and mental mess (i see one here) that Buddhas thought it fit NOT to take them to Buddhalands

Malcolm wrote:

Ram,

You may not be aware of this but "male member" is a polite euphemism for penis. I was just kidding around with you.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 9:01 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

The object of an undeluded cognition is an ultimate truth

'Scuse my ignorance but wouldn't that then imply that all objects of an undeluded cognition are expressions of ultimate truth? ie All objects per se? I cannot imagine an enlightened being having an instance of deluded cognition in regards to any type of object.

Malcolm wrote:

It means that all objects of undeluded cognitions are ultimate truths.

For example, a bodhisattva on the paths and stages has undeluded cognition in equipoise, but deluded cognition in post-equipoise; though that deluded cognition is qualitatively different than an unawakened person's in terms of intensity.

Buddhas only undeluded cognitions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Let just clarify a point in general -- I was not saying that "Dzogchen is restricted to the nine yanas gradual approach".

There are many Dzogchen texts that explicitly place the path they teach, as opposed to outer common atiyoga, outside the nine yanas.

Even so, this does not render Dzogchen sans Buddhism.

heart said:

If it was outside the nine yanas it would be outside Buddhism. The whole idea of the nine yanas is an Ati perspective anyway. "Outer common atiyoga" what is that?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Magnus:

The system of the nine yānas is actually an Anuyoga perspective, where Dzogchen is conceived of as the result of Anuyoga practice.

However, since the dgongs pa zang thal cycle, the Vima snying thig cycles, etc., frequently define the most secret unsurpassed great perfection cycle as not part of the nine yānas I am pretty comfortable in asserting there is a dzogchen that lies outside the nine yānas. This is the source of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu's assertion that there are two approaches to Dzogchen, one gradual, based on the nine yānas; and one which does not depend on the nine yānas at all, Dzogchen as a completely self-contained system of realization that does not depend at all on the vehicles of cause and result.

The Lamp The Severs Proliferation from the Copper Lettered Collection in the Vima snying thig has the following passage which will put things in context:

"The conceited vehicles of the nine yānas
do not depart even a an iota from eternalism and annihilationism."

The two can be taught separately, interwoven, or side by side.

Saying that the utterly secret unsurpassed cycle of Dzogchen is outside the nine yānas is the teaching of Nirmanakāya Garab Dorje. Therefore, since it is the teaching of Nirmanakāya Garab Dorje, it is not outside the pale of Buddhism.

Common Atiyoga is the basically sems sde, in this scheme of things.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

TMingyur said:

Actually this means the "ultimate nature of all things" is a mere thought. I think that's the point if one harbors the thought "ultimate nature of all things".

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no -- actually Candarkirti defines a truth as an _object_ of a cognition. [/quote]

Well, yes ... however one may share his view or not.

I have just picked this sentence out of the context with which you might have referred to Candrakirti's view exclusively (without wanting to assert that yourself).

[/quote]

The point is whether the cognition is deluded or undeluded in a definitive sense. The object of an undeluded cognition is an ultimate truth. The emphasis lays on the cognition apprehending the object, not the object. But since there cannot be a cognition at all sans an object, it is important to include an object in the formulation of how a truth is defined.

I select Chandrakirti for convenience since he is generally regarded as the authoritative commentarial voice concerning Nagarjuna's corpus of Madhyamaka works.

If we were talking about the two truths in other systems, for example, Sarvastivada, I would cite Vasuybandhu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 10:58 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Emptiness is the ultimate nature of things. That is why it is called ultimate truth.

TMingyur said:

Actually this means the "ultimate nature of all things" is a mere thought. I think that's the point if one harbors the thought "ultimate nature of all things".

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no -- actually Candarkirti defines a truth as an _object_ of a cognition. Depending upon whether that cognition is deluded or undeluded, the object in question is either an ultimate truth or a relative truth.

The thought "things are empty is just an enumerated ultimate, a conceptual ultimate. This must be distinguished from the non-enumerated ultimate truth that is a veridical cognition of the object, the ultimate nature of a given thing, i.e. its emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 8:06 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Namdrol said:

"Emptiness is not a quality or a nature of things"

This is the main one.

Sherab said:

I am not too sure about that.

Things ultimately have no nature. Emptiness itself is also empty. So how can emptiness be a nature or quality of things in the ultimate sense.

Conventionally, things have nature. So if emptiness is the nature of things, it must be in the conventional sense. But to say emptiness is the conventional nature of things also does not make much sense to me. It would be like saying water is (conventionally) wet and empty at the same time. "Wet and empty" makes no sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is the ultimate nature of things. That is why it is called ultimate truth.

Candrakirti said, all things possess two natures, one relative, one ultimate.

Incidentally, emptiness is termed "the natureless nature".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Sherab said:

Please explain what you think Norman was trying to say. Thanks.

Namdrol said:

I said I tried... when I parsed it, I came up with contradictions. Better to let Norman reinterpret for us.

Sherab said:

What are the contradictions that you discovered?

Malcolm wrote:

"Emptiness is not a quality or a nature of things"

This is the main one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Astus said:

Do they have the same Vajrasamadhi Sutra in Tibet as in East Asia? I mean, the one

commented by Wohyo and translated by Robert E. Buswell Jr.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, indeed they do, translated from Chinese.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Did I miss the bunfight?!

Damn! I luv a good bunfight! Did anybody get a nosebleed?

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, just usual internet schoolyard recess behavior.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The main point is that the method of meditation is not put into the mahayana sutras in any extensive, or detailed manner.

dzoki said:

I am no expert on this topic, but I think Samadhiraja and Vajrasamadhi sutras might have some instructions on meditation.

*edited for doublequoting

Malcolm wrote:

Quite detailed in the case of the latter -- as well as the Samdhinirmocana, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: How can we help dead animals in the bardo?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Cool. Yes, this is in fact the meditation taught by Tulku Thondup that I was referred to

the book for.

- Tom

Malcolm wrote:
You can do Shitro.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 12:27 AM
Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists
Content:
Rael said:
.did i tell you i'm mad as a march hare...and speak me mind far to openly...lol...in real life too it seems

modding is such sweet sorrow...i loathe itlol

welcome a bored

Malcolm wrote:
You didn't have to tell me...

Plain speaking is a virtue.

It is sad when people see you through a reputation they have projected.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 12:10 AM
Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists
Content:
Rael said:
Namdrol i think you want to be a mod...
from your e-sangha comment...and member ridicule fun stuff deal....

Malcolm wrote:
Not on your life. Being a moderator is just a headache. People engage in amazingly irrational projections about your person, etc.

Anyway Rael,I did not ridicule anyone's person, though I did offer my thoughts about ram peshwar's ridiculously sexist post.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2011 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Sherab said:

Please explain what you think Norman was trying to say. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

I said I tried... when I parsed it, I came up with contradictions. Better to let Norman reinterpret for us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Ego cosmic energy

Content:

ram peswani said:

WHY, WHY ,WHY?

Why does dragon girl turn into MALE before becoming Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

Why does the goddess of the Ganges turn Shariputra into woman?

ram peswani said:

Why Purna has only Male members in the universe which he will rule in future?

Malcolm wrote:

Imagine, a universe full of penises.

ram peswani said:

Why does Guatam Buddha bestow prophesy of Buddhahood to Male members only?

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously, it is because only penises can become buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Jikan said:

In this thread...

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=3556> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;"

...the question of whether nembutsu (reciting the name of Buddha Amitabha) is in itself a tantric practice. It's OT to that thread, so here it is in a new one.

Tantric Buddhism (Vajrayana, Mikkyo) is a form of Mahayana practice that necessarily involves several elements. Among these are abhiseka (empowerment), qualified guru... and a certain way of understanding reality. (tantra means "continuum.")

Not all these elements are present in nembutsu practice, so it makes no sense to say it is in fact a tantric practice. It is like tantric practice in some respects, however.

Questions, comments, or corrections?

TMingyur said:

Only one comment:

One may become obsessed with the finger pointing to the moon if there is much thinking about the finger, identifying with the finger thinking "This finger is 'mine', 'I' am the finger. By means of the finger I will attain such and such." Based on this the finger is investigated and studied in great detail.

In that way one may become an eloquent finger expert.

Kind regards

Malcolm wrote:

The old finger and the moon snub...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: The Problem With Buddhists

Content:

plwk said:

It's all... <http://freedomforall.net/the-problem-with-buddhists/>

What do you think? A valid observation or just a rant or both?

Malcolm wrote:

Proof of rebirth -- this guy was bounced from e-sangha. And what do you know, here he is again...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Let just clarify a point in general -- I was not saying that "Dzogchen is restricted to the nine yanas gradual approach".

There are many Dzogchen texts that explicitly place the path they teach, as opposed to outer common atiyoga, outside the nine yanas.

Even so, this does not render Dzogchen sans Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: The Medicinal Value of Incense

Content:

plwk said:

Interesting Namdrol...

Is incense effective for skin conditions like eczema or fungal infections?

Malcolm wrote:

Certain skin conditions induced by vata, rough, dry skin, for example, will be helped over all by a vata-reducing regimen. If it is pitta related, then burning sandalwood can be effective.

Sandal wood essential oil may be helpful for certain skin rashes; for fungal infections, try using refined sesame oil. Sesame oil has anti-fungal properties. But it depends on the dosha involved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: The Medicinal Value of Incense

Content:

plwk said:

How is it utilised in Tibetan Medicine?

Malcolm wrote:

There are many different formulas for incense on Tibetan Medicine.

However, there is one brand called sold under the name "Nirvana" which is actually the formula called Agar 31. It is used for Vata disturbances (i.e. high wind or rlung), insomnia, to induce calm, and so on. This can be crushed as used as an oral medicine as well (under prescription from doctor).

Properly formulated Tibetan incense is held to repel bhutas, and so on. In other words,

it can be used for aromatherapy.

Properly formulated Tibetan incense is like good wine or ghee, it's medicinal value is enhanced by aging.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Garab Dorje was an emanation of Vajrasattva/Vajradhara. He was not an ordinary human being, according to the Dzogchen tradition. He possessed all of the infinite qualities of a nirmanakāya. Padmasambhava was predicted by Shakyamuni in the sutras to be greater than himself, according to many biographies of Padmasambhava.

Mariusz said:

So why they are not listed among the 1000 Buddhas of time of existence of our fortunate universum?

Malcolm wrote:

Hinayana Sutras do not list the Buddhas who teach Mahayana. They list only seven or four buddhas. Mahayana sutras do not list the teachers of Dzogchen, nor the eons in which they occur.

Namdrol said:

The so called "mind transmission" of Dzogchen is not something a teacher places in your head. It is your knowledge of the real meaning of Dzogchen teachings. That happens whenever you awaken that knowledge after you have received Dzogchen transmission in general.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Kongtrul the Great the mind transmission of Dzogchen can happen directly from Samantabhadra to high-level bodhisattvas without Garab Dorje or other Teacher.
[/quote]

From the point of view of Dzogchen, attaining buddhahood is the state of Dzogchen. But from the point of view of Dzogchen, the vehicles of cause and effect cannot result in buddhahood. They are of provisional meaning or of indirect meaning.

[/quote]

Nevertheless it was transmited to Garab Dorje and other "twelve Dzogchen teachers" and Padmasambhava only as I remeber. According to terma of Pema Lingpa

Padmasambhava had Samantabhadra and Vajrasattva, not only Garab Dorje, as His Teachers of Dzogchen.[/quote]

There are a few lineages of Dzogchen man ngag sde -- Garab Dorje, Manjushrimitra, Shri Singha, Jnanasutra, Vimalamitra;

Garab Dorje, Shri Singha, Vimalamitra in tandem with Padmasamabhava;

Garab Dorje, Manjushrimitra, Shri Singha, Vimalamitra;

Then Garab Dorje, Shri Singha, Padmasamabhava;

Then Garab Dorje, Padmasamabhava;

Garab Dorje, Shri Singha, Vairocana;

There is also a lineage of Samantabhadra, Vajrasattva, Padmasambhava -- for example, the Khon Vajrakilaya gives this lineage. This just means that Padmsambhava was a full vidyādhara, a buddha possessing all three kāyas completely. So yes, there are terma systems where the lineage of Dzogchen teachings is as you describe, even so, believe it or not, Padmasambhava declares to Yeshe Tsogyal that Vimalamitra, and not he, is the main regent of Dzogchen teachings in Tibet. The reason Padmasambhava teaches her Dzogchen is that she did not have the karmic connection with Vimalamitra to learn Dzogchen from him, or so it is stated in the dgongs pa zang thal.

And lots of other lineages too numerous to mention both long and short, kama and terma.

In any case, Dzogchen is not subject to the criteria of sutra. Things such as Supreme Nirmanakāyas and all this stuff is just a conceptual limitation created by trying fit Dzogchen within the narrow hermeneutics of Mahāyāna sūtra dogmatism. That is like trying to fit Mahāyāna sutra criteria into Hīnayāna sūtra dogmatism.

Just as Mahāyāna shares some features with Hīnayāna, Dzogchen shares some features with Mahāyāna, but just as Mahāyāna cannot fit inside of the narrow criteria imposed by the Hīnayāna conception of the personage of buddhas; likewise, Dzogchen cannot fit inside the broader, yet still limiting conception of the personage of buddhas imposed by common mahāyāna. In other words, if you try to impose a common Mahāyāna hermeneutical framework on Dzogchen, it does not work. It is best to abandon that framework since it is not important in Dzogchen and does not work at all. So while Shakyamuni is considered one of the twelve historical teachers of Dzogchen prior to Garab Dorje for reason we have already discussed (he predicted the arrival of the effortless vehicle in the future), our teachings of Dzogchen do not come from Shakyamuni and there is no evidence that he ever taught it on Jambudvīpa.

Nirmanakāyas do not have the certainty of place, time, teacher, teaching and retinue. Just accept that and move on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

Pero said:

And what are they? Ngondro?

Malcolm wrote:

I think you have to write them and ask.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Garab Dorje is not a tulku in the Tibetan cultural sense of the term. He is a tulku in the Padmasambhava and Shakyamuni sense of the term i.e. a nirmanakāya of compassion.

Mariusz said:

As I know Garab Dorje realized the Body of Light (Wyl. A'od-Phung) and Padmasambhava the Great Transference Body (Wyl. Pho-Ba Ch'en-Po).

So are Garab Dorje and Padmasambhava the same Supreme Nirmanakayas as Buddha Shakyamuni and Buddha Maitreya who have limitless qualities (as 64 main features of Buddhahood, 18 distinctive qualities of Buddhahood, 32 physical marks of the Perfect One, 64 verbal marks of the Perfect One, 9 qualities and skills of Perfect One's enlightening influence and so on)?

Malcolm wrote:

Garab Dorje was an emanation of Vajrasattva/Vajradhara. He was not an ordinary human being, according to the Dzogchen tradition. He possessed all of the infinite qualities of a nirmanakāya. Padmasambhava was predicted by Shakyamuni in the sutras to be greater than himself, according to many biographies of Padmasambhava.

Anyway, this sort of limitation is unnecessary. Both Shakyamuni Buddha and Garab Dorje are emanations of Vajradhara -- their historical manifestation and set of teachings is different, but their continuums ultimately the same. Even so, in terms of historical manifestation, Garab Dorje is more important for Dzogchen practitioners. Thus we have many dzogchen guru yogas of Garab Dorje, no dzogchen guru yogas of Shakyamuni at all. Not even one. Why? Because the historical manifestation, Shakyamuni, is not in the lineage of Dzogchen. This is not a criticism of Shakyamuni, not at all. It is just a

recognition of how the teachings come to us.

Namdrol said:

Maitreya won't even teach Vajrayāna, let alone Dzogchen.

Again, can we be absolutely sure Buddha Maitreya Supreme Nirmanakaya will never teach any transmission of Dzogchen to anyone human or non-human anywhere in Human Realm or elsewhere it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I think so. The issue of the rarity of Vajrayāna teachings is a common issue. Not uncommon.

However, there are twelve other world systems besides this one where the Dzogchen teachings exist presently according to Dzogchen tantras.

Namdrol said:

Moreover, I suspect here and now is the mind transmission of Dzogchen for us, even without Garab Dorje, but we are simply not ready for it. This kind of "thing" is beyond any identity, time and place.

Malcolm wrote:

The so called "mind transmission" of Dzogchen is not something a teacher places in your head. It is your knowledge of the real meaning of Dzogchen teachings. That happens whenever you awaken that knowledge after you have received Dzogchen transmission in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

muni said:

Can the nature be accomplished by/through 10 buddhist tantra techniques, or maybe must add "only" along them.

Dzogchen only possible through Mahayana-Vajrayana? still in no way Dzogchen exclude any fruit of teaching, as all inclusive spontaneous.

Just clarity, no

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen does not require the ten tattvas described by the Anutarrayoga tantras, at least not according to Kun byed rgyal po rgyud.

Dzogchen does not require the methods of the vehicles of cause and the vehicles of result.

Even so, these two fact mention above do not place any teaching of Dzogchen "outside" Buddhism even though utterly secret unsurpassed Dzogchen is outside the nine yānas.

As it is said, sems sde is for intellectuals; klong sde is for those who like to meditate; man ngag sde is for those who practice according to intimate instructions.

Then among man ngag sde cycles there is outer, inner, secret and utterly secret, etc.

Still, even the most advanced Dzogchen practitioners go refuge, cultivate bodhicitta and dedicate merits i.e. use the three sublime principles of the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:49 AM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

Namdrol said:

http://www.nitarthainstitute.org/publications_nitartha.shtml "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; at the bottom.

Pero said:

Is this useful for all Vajrayana students? Are there any restrictions on its purchase?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes and yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:47 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Heruka said:

this is a great quote.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, opening maṅgalaṃ from the mūlamadhyamakakarikas.

Heruka said:

sound, light and rays!

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Heruka said:

are you saying that the beyond or as you imply and bait, the quintessential essence, the mother milk of prajñāpāramita and mahdhyamaka is a proper object of study?

Malcolm wrote:

No you missed my point -- if you feel that being in a state of great equanimity free from coming and going and so is a unique point of Dzogchen, it isn't.

There are unique points in Dzogchen, of course -- but none of them place Dzogchen outside the pale of Buddhism, and are actually just answers to the basic questions Buddhism presents, just variations on Buddhist answers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:42 AM

Title: Re: Approaching Nagarjuna and the Mulamadhyamakakarika...

Content:

dumb bonbu said:

hi folks, in a couple of weeks or thereabouts i'm going to be picking Garfield's translation of 'The Fundamental Wisdom..' up off the shelf....or perhaps not lol! because firstly (aware that many find it a notoriously difficult text) i want to prep myself as much as is possible so i have a few questions -

Malcolm wrote:

It is not all that hard if you have studied Abhidharma first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:40 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

It is as similar in that it is Buddhist meditation involving Shamatha and vipashyana.. just like all the Buddhist schools but other than that it is much more similar to the rest of Tibetan Buddhism than anything found in Chan - koans and the like.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Koans and the like is Post Sung Dynasty Chan.

Kagyü Mahāmudrā is very similar to original Chan. This is not a bad thing, this is good thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Umm no its really not.. I've heard several Dzogchen Masters say that Dzogchen goes along the 5 paths and 10 stages also... How you can say it doesn't is beyond me. cig char ba has to do with the person, not what tenet system one clings to...

Malcolm wrote:

Well you have your masters, and I have mine. According to my masters, Dzogchen is not a gradual path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:24 AM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Nangwa said:

Has anyone tried to understand what Norman was trying to say?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Heruka said:

remaining in the state of great evenness beyond coming and going, their minds beyond clarification or obscuration and so on....

Malcolm wrote:

This is no different than prajñāpāramitā and mahādharmaka.

I pay homage to him,
the best of teachers, by whom dependent origination --
not ceasing, not arising;
not annihilated, not permanent;
not going, not coming;
not differentiated, not identical --
was taught as peace to pacify proliferation.

So you need something a bit more than that statement if you are to demonstrate some teaching that renders Dzogchen "not Buddhism".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 10:13 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

Kagyu Mahāmudra is nothing like Chan. Usually it's Dzogchen that gets compared with Chan, but actually sense all Tibetan schools assert that one must follow the gradual path of the 5 paths and the 10 bhumis to achieve enlightenment they are in accordance with the traditions of the Dharma preserved by the Indian panditas at the likes of Nalanda and Vikramāśīla monasteries and not like the Buddhism that went to China and was influenced by Daoism and Confucianism.

Malcolm wrote:

Kagyu Mahāmudra in many respects is very similar to Chan, and even uses Chan sūtras like the Vajrasamādhi sūtra to support its dkar po gcig thub presentation. When Sapan was criticizing a "Chinese Dzogchen" he had in mind dkar po gcig thub i.e. Lama Zhang's presentation of Gampopa's Mahāmudra system. He does not criticize Dzogchen, actually since he regards it as part of the Nyingma completion stage.

Not all Dharma systems in Tibet assert that one must follow the five paths and ten stages approach. For example, Dzogchen. Dzogchen is definitely a cig char ba presentation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

conebeckham said:

Namdrol wrote: Yes, Zabmo Nangdon has been translated by E. Callahan.

Really? What's the English title, if you know?

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.nitarthainstitute.org/publications_nitartha.shtml "onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; at the bottom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

mr. gordo said:

Thanks Nangwa, dzoki and Namdrol.

Perhaps I should have been more specific when I said "detailed". I'm not looking for diagrams of all 72,000 channels. I'm more concerned with the 3 major ones. Specifically how they link to the crown of the head, between the eyes and below the naval. Also I think I've been misunderstanding how (and if) they connect to the urethra and anus. This misunderstanding is a bit disturbing to me as I'm concerned about the status of my practice now. That's why a side view is important for me since the front view diagrams I have aren't that clear. This is in reference to Sarma tradition too. PM's would be much appreciated.

There is also the Third Karmapa's book, zang mon nang don i.e profound inner topics. I don't suppose this is in English Namdrol?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Zabmo Nangdon has been translated by E. Callahan.

According the Kalacakra, three channels in question govern feces elimination (avadhūti); ejaculation/menstruation (rasanā) and urination (lalanā).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Book showing Channels in the Body

Content:

dzoki said:

Hi Gordo,

there will soon be a book on this topic published by Shang Shung publications. It is a translation of the text by Gyalwa Yangongpa called Rdo rje lus kyi sbas bshad which was done by Elio Gaurisco. This text is supposed to be a complete description of all the 72000 channels, but I have no clue whether there will be illustrations of all of this. It should be out this year, but who knows?

Malcolm wrote:

This is an interesting book. It does not describe 72,000 channels in detail however.

People should however know that it is Sarma tradition. There is also the Third Karmapa's book, zang mon nang don i.e profound inner topics.

People should understand that the presentation in Nyingma is different in important ways.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Heruka said:

dzogchen in its purest form is beyond buddhist concepts, yet buddhism in its purest form is dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of dharma: dharma of text and dharma of realization.

There are two kinds of buddhism: buddhism of text and buddhism of realization.

There are two kinds of dzogchen: dzogchen of texts and dzogchen of realization.

In order to establish that "dzogchen" is "without buddhism"; one would have to identify something in Buddhism that Dzogchen is missing; or conversely, something in Dzogchen that Buddhism is missing.

In reality, Dzogchen is just another way of explaining śūnyatāprābhāsvarāsamḃhedaḥ in relation to the trikāya. No matter how profound Dzogchen may be (and it is the most profound teaching of Buddhism), it does not go beyond explaining how to realize the trikāya state through knowledge (vidyā,) of one's own basis (sthāna):
emptiness (śūnyatā, stong pa nyid; svarūpa, ngo bo; visuddha, ka dag; dharmakāya)
luminosity ('od gsal, prābhāsvarā; prakriti, rang bzhin) nirabhogana, thun grub;
sambhogakāya)
inseparability (āsamḃhedaḥ, dbyer med; karuna, thugs rje; nirmanakāya)

Since śūnyatāprābhāsvarāsamḃhedaḥ is nothing more than what the Buddha taught, even Dzogchen cannot go beyond being a teaching of a Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2011 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: meaning of amrita, rakta and bhalinta

Content:

mmm said:

Dear friends, can anybody share teachings on outer, inner and secret meaning of offering of maha pantsa amrita, rakta and bhalinta in regard to kjerim, dzogrim and great perfection? thank you, good bye, mmm

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Not appropriate. If you are in Dzogchen Community for example, there are many books which explain these things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

conebeckham said:

This Kagyupa would just like to point out that, in practice, I don't think there is anyone who practices only the so-called "Sutra Mahamudra." The way it is taught, these days, incorporates elements of Tantra Mahamudra and even, in some cases, aspects of "essence" mahamudra.

And as for "Essence Mahamudra," there is, in fact, a "Practice"--if you want to call it that. It is the path on which one receives a special kind of empowerment, that's the "method."

Most, if not all, Kagyupas engage in some form of deity yoga, and even pranayama, as well as vipassana and samatha, and we apply these methods in combination with the "View" of Mahamudra. I have never met a Kagyu Lama who does not embrace Vajrayana methods. Then again, I haven't met every Kagyu Lama.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, but they are explained separately. For example, the four yogas of mahāmudra along with the detailed introduction of the nature of the mind, for example, like in Bokar Rinpoche pithy condensation, are explained separately from the six yogas of Naropa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Nangwa said:

Its really much better.

"Matter" allows for the much more inclusive meaning you posted in this quote:

"The rūpa in question here is rūpaskandha i.e. "so too sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness"".

Making what is already an incredibly pithy quote much more encompassing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since the rūpaskandha includes all material five sense organs and all five sense objects i.e. everything made of the four elements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:50 PM

Title: Open Webcast with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu: Mandarava

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Singapore is exactly twelve hours ahead of US Eastern Standard Time, thus 10 am on March 31st is 10 PM March 30 EST.

<http://www.shangshunginstitute.net/webcast/video.php> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

=====

here is the schedule of next retreat,

****WE CANT CONFIRM THE WEBCAST**** since we don't have info about internet connection at the venue where the retreat will take place. Updates will be sent as soon as we receive that info.

31-3-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN

1-4-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN

2-4-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN

3-4-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN

1-4-2011 Ganapuja ,14:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN

4-4-2011 Mandarava Teachings ,10-12:00 GMT+8 (Singapore) OPEN

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Nangwa said:

There are lot of unnecessary elaborations going on here when one of the most famous sutra quotes of all time pretty clearly represents all the necessary information to answer the question.

"Form is emptiness, emptiness is form."

Interdependence/dependent origination is how we understand the appearance of forms etc. and since form is non other than emptiness.....

There is no need to draw complex philosophical distinctions when the teachings are quite clear.

Namdrol said:

Please revise your translation

"Matter is emptiness..."

The rūpa in question here is rūpaskandha i.e. "so too sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness".

And yes, whatever "arises together" (samutpāda) "in dependence" (pratītya) is empty.

Nangwa said:

Consider my translation revised. That makes the sutra quote even more clear on the point.

thanks N.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I am a little wrong,

it is really is "Matter is empty, emptiness is matter" that is the most precise rendering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Questioning Height

Content:

Namdrol said:

Saraha did not only write nice dohas. He also wrote an extensive and detailed commentary on the Buddhakāpala tantra (now rather obscure), and a number of sadhanas.

gregkavarnos said:

Care to let us in on some details about the subjects of the sadhanas?

Malcolm wrote:

He wrote a sadhana of Buddhakāpala, a sadhana of Vajrayogini, and a sadhana of Mahakala, and so on, as well as a commentary on completion stage called Svādhiṣṭhanakrama. Who knows, maybe there other works.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: emptiness = interdependence?

Content:

Nangwa said:

There are lot of unnecessary elaborations going on here when one of the most famous sutra quotes of all time pretty clearly represents all the necessary information to answer the question.

"Form is emptiness, emptiness is form."

Interdependence/dependent origination is how we understand the appearance of forms etc. and since form is non other than emptiness.....

There is no need to draw complex philosophical distinctions when the teachings are quite clear.

Malcolm wrote:

Please revise your translation

"Matter is emptiness..."

The rūpa in question here is rūpaskandha i.e. "so too sensation, ideation, formations and consciousness".

And yes, whatever "arises together" (samutpāda) "in dependence" (pratītya) is empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Namdrol said:

Perhaps, but none of them are tantric.

Aemilius said:

What makes you think teachings are "tantric" if they are rGyud?

On what grounds do you decide whether oral teachings in Kenia, Uganda or Ethiopia are tantric or not ?

Surely it is not dependent on the word "tantra" ?

Malcolm wrote:

We have been over this one. I am not into repeating myself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The point is that if you attain dhyana, samadhi and samapatti you attain whole universes of knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Without vipaśyāna, dhyana, samadhi and samapatti just led to rebirth in deva realms.

Aemilius said:

This knowledge has existed much before what you call "the advent of tantra", it has existed from the beginning, This is the inner experience area, it is also the area of tantra. It seems that there developed some schools that consciously deny the inner experience aspect of Dharma, in name only they accept that there is "enlightenment", their "enlightenment" is without knowledge and without experience, only then is it "true" enlightenment.

In the history of Dharma there is inner experience from the very beginning, therefore there is also tantra, or the likeness of tantra, from the very beginning. But then there are people with authority and power who want to decide what "true " enlightenment is, and hence they start their own schools whose main purpose is to wipe out some irritating persons and their influence who actually attained dhyana, samadhi and samapatti. I think that for example Buddhaghosha had a wealth of inner the Dharma, I would even say that innerly he was a tantric, this is because of the necessary dynamics of the dhyana process.

Is this so difficult to understand?

Malcolm wrote:

I understand your point of view, though I do not agree with it. I don't agree with your conspiracy theory either.

You seem think that Vajrayāna is all about dhyāna, samapatti and samadhi. It isn't.

Vajrayāna practice is a method of reversing dependent origination. Of course, in that process we need to use samadhi and samapatti. But not in the way it is used in sutrayāna methodology.

There is a school in Tibetan Buddhism called the Kagyu school. They teach a system called mahāmudra. They assert that mahāmudra is also found in the Mahāyāna sūtras

(but not, of course in Hīnayāna sūtras. And they teach, in their mahāmudra, a system called sūtra mahāmudra which is the basis of the famed four yogas of mahāmudra of Gampopa. They emphasize the practice of dhyana in their system of mahāmudra

They also clearly recognize a mahāmudra that comes from Vajrayāna practice. They further recognize a type of mahāmudra that comes from sudden insight based on a kind of introduction by a master, called essence mahāmudra.

They clearly differentiate sūtra mahāmudra and "tantric" mahāmudra by the methods that are used. The methods used in tantric mahāmudra are things like creation stage (visualizing oneself as a deity), mantra recitation, working with prāṇayāma (not mindfulness of breathing), "erotic" yogas, yogas connected with sleep, waking, etc.

The methods used in sutra mahāmudra are solely śamatha and vipaśyāna combined with the four yogas -- which are really stages in the deepening of śamatha and vipaśyāna.

Essence mahāmudra has no methods.

Vajrayāna is different than sūtra teachings because the methods of deity yoga, prāṇayāma, etc., are never taught in sūtra. No cakras, no ṇāḍīs, etc. None of that newage hippy Vajrayāna stuff is found in the sūtras, nor explained by sūtra masters -- not in India, not in China, not in Japan.

We Vajrayānists assert that all of our hippy methods, deity yoga, and so on, cause our path to be faster than the pure Mahāyāna sūtra route. These criteria did not evolve in Tibet, they evolved in India. Of course, there is some internal debate as I mentioned above. The Kagyu school in many respects is close to Chan school and even uses some Chan scriptures as a basis for their arguments.

You can accept or reject Vajrayāna claims -- but at least you should clearly understand what they are -- a clarity that thus far has been absent in your presentation.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Questioning Height

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Apparently he was an abbot at Nalanda and teacher to Nagarjuna!

The question though is what did he learn and what did he teach?

Malcolm wrote:

Saraha did not only write nice dohas. He also wrote an extensive and detailed

commentary on the Buddhakāpala tantra (now rather obscure), and a number of sadhanas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The main point is that the method of meditation is not put into the mahayana sutras in any extensive, or detailed manner.

It is neither there in the Lotus sutra, but the Lotus sutra schools have an immense amount of oral instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but none of them are tantric.

Aemilius said:

Same is true with regard of Amitabha sutras, and Avatamsaka sutra school which also has important oral teachings connected to the Sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but still none of them are tantric.

Aemilius said:

The method existed as oral instructions within the Mahayana movement for more than one thousand of years.

Even now the method has never been wholly put into a bookform.

Consequently true Mahayana has not existed without a method or upaya.

You can't say that method is absent in Mahayana when it is an oral tradition.

It is ridiculous to say that the method is absent in the Mahayana, which is what you seem to imply, am I right ?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyana has methods, but they are not tantric, and will not lead to full awakening in a single lifetime.

Aemilius said:

Another point I was making is that tantra did not exist as a separate school, but rather as an inner aspect of the Mahayana.

This is said by Guru Rimpoche, i.e. that tantra is an inner aspect of the Mahayana, and sutra is its outer aspect, (in one of the books translated by Eric Pema Kunzang).

I also pointed out that only recently has tantra become something that exists as an

outer public school and as public teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Mantrayāna is sometimes referred to as uncommon Mahāyāna.

Aemilius said:

If someone attains full awakening within the Mahayana then he has received the Abhisheka, right? Are you happy with that ?

Malcolm wrote:

After three incalculable eons.

Aemilius said:

Or do you want to grasp at some fundamentalist tantrist view in which "no one outside my guru's lineage has ever attained enlightenment because they have not received His abhisheka"? -or something similar?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyanists certainly attain awakening -- after three incalculable aeons. If they enter into the method of secret mantra, then they can shorten that duration to one, three, seven or at most sixteen lifetimes.

Aemilius said:

If I have got it right this is what bigoted tibetans want to say, or they say it in a roundabout way, and they want You to say that!

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it is what "bigoted" Indian acaryas claimed for secret mantra teachings in distinction to common Mahāyāna teachings like the Lanka, Avatamska, etc. Tibetans, Chinese, and Japanese Buddhists just accepted their word for it. As so I -- but not without good reason.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Let us put it this way -- there is no record of a nirmanakāya known as Shakyamuni teaching Dzogchen. None of the Dzogchen teachings that we have presently came from Shakyamuni. They all, every last one, come from the nirmanakāya known as Garab Dorje.

Garab Dorje is the predicted teacher of Dzogchen, not Shakyamuni.

Mariusz said:

Could be but irrelevant Can Shakyamuni as the Supreme Nirmanakya be compared with Garab Dorje as only a tulku (trans. Nirmanakaya)? I guess Garab Dorje is only a tulku, somehow "the predicted teacher" particularity "emanated" to teach Dzogchen, because the next supreme Nirmanakaya will be Maitreya Buddha only. The Supreme Nirmanakaya is limitless, not only particular for any class of teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Maitreya won't even teach Vajrayāna, let alone Dzogchen.

Garab Dorje is not a tulku in the Tibetan cultural sense of the term. He is a tulku in the Padmasambhava and Shakyamuni sense of the term i.e. a nirmanakāya of compassion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 8:09 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

tamdrin said:

Namdrol,

In one of your posts you mentioned that people here could be guilty of tawa chogs dzin.. Holding views as supreme or something like that.. I believe that tawa chog dzin refers to holding asceticism and ritual/discipline to be supreme methods of liberation . Certainly the Buddha held views that were correct to be superior to views which were incorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two terms -- one is ལྟ་བུ་ཕྱགས་འཛིན་ -- holding a biased view. What you are taking about is ལྟ་བུ་མཚན་ཁྲ་འཛིན་པ་, dṛṣṭiparāmarśaḥ -- this is simply holding something inferior or hīna as good or high. They sound very similar in Tibetan, and it is possible that in common language they have become somewhat interchangeable.

What you mention above is in fact śīlavrataparāmarśaḥ as well as mithyādṛṣṭi i.e. false views. While we are at it, the other two, just to round things out are satkāyadṛṣṭi and antagrāhadṛṣṭi respectively, holding a view of personal identity and holding a view of extremes (either existence or non-existence).

I was just saying that people are often chauvinistic about this issue of eating meat, almost becoming like Devadatta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

The idea of Buddhism without Buddhism is the idea of making ones religious practice to be primarily based on looking within, as the Tibetan term ngang pa- inner person denotes, rather than becoming Buddhist by accepting a prescribed set of beliefs about reality and then engaging corresponding set of rituals for dealing with that reality.

Namdrol said:

I would the former is Buddhism with Buddhism (i.e. nang pa (ནང་པ)) whereas that latter is Buddhism without Buddhism.

What you describe in the latter half of your post is vedic ritualism, shamanism, etc.

tamdrin said:

not if it is embraced by buddhist views and goals.. perhaps it would have been better to have said practices...

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddhist view is essentially that all situations of samsara and nirvana come from inside and are resolved by looking inside. You cannot say that there is one kind of Buddhism which is "insider", and another kind of Buddhism that is "outsider". The essence of the Buddhist view is in "insiderness". There isn't other kind of Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

tamdrin said:

The idea of Buddhism without Buddhism is the idea of making ones religious practice to be primarily based on looking within, as the Tibetan term ngang pa- inner person denotes, rather than becoming Buddhist by accepting a prescribed set of beliefs about reality and then engaging corresponding set of rituals for dealing with that reality.

Malcolm wrote:

I would the former is Buddhism with Buddhism (i.e. nang pa (ནང་པ)) whereas that latter is Buddhism without Buddhism.

What you describe in the latter half of your post is vedic ritualism, shamanism, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2011 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Need help identifying deity

Content:

pemachophel said:

This thangka does not look PRC-made to me.

Malcolm wrote:

I saw tons of thangkas of similar type when I was in Tibet in 2009 in tourist "Tibetan" shops run by Chinese merchants.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: H.H. Sakya Trizin 2011 Tour -- Boston

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

May 26 Padmsambhava Empowerment

May 27 Chakrasamvara in the Vajra Gantipa Tradition – Day 1

May 28 Chakrasamvara in the Vajra Gantipa Tradition – Day 2

May 29 Long-Life Initiation and Changchog Rite (purification ceremony for the dead)

Holiday Inn Convention Center

242 Adams Place, Boxborough

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Conze remarks that there is very little actual meditation practice instructions, or none at all, in the Mahayana Sutras.

Namdrol said:

Conze must not have read many Mahayana sutras, then.

Aemilius said:

You know the basic instructions about sitting posture, breathing, gaze, etc...!? You don't find them in The Diamond sutra or in other Prajna Paramita sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

But they exist in many other sutras.

Aemilius said:

I can't remember where in the Lankavatara Sutra Bhagavan talks about the abhisheka of the Tenth Bhumi? I do know that he talks in several times about "baptism by the

buddhas" (in words of T.D. Suzuki), this must be the abhisheka you mentioned?

Malcolm wrote:

I can't tell you exact location -- but it is something cited frequently in Tibetan sources to show that abhisheka is indispensable for full awakening.

Aemilius said:

Besides Avatamsaka Sutra there is in Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sutra "Consecration into independent knowledge" (Robert Thurman's translation), which sounds like an abhisheka.

Then there is "receiving prediction (vyākaraṇa)" that seems like an initiation, it is mentioned in Mahayana texts, like the White Lotus of the True Law.

Malcolm wrote:

In Vajrayana, abhisheka is a method of attaining full awakening from Yoga Tantra on up. If you do not attain full awakening, then you have methods of sadhana, creation stage, completion stage and so on.

These methods are all completely absent from sūtrayāna teachings. Sūtrayāna is vehicle of the cause; Vajrayāna is the vehicle of the result.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Need help identifying deity

Content:

Dhondrub said:

looks like guru dragpo

Inge said:

From what I have been told, Guru Drakpo has a nine-headed scorpion in his left hand.

Malcolm wrote:

In these kinds of PRC fakes, they never get any of the details correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Will said:

Greg,

No argument from me. But rediscovery of an ancient path, suggests to me a path found again in meditation; not found in an existing school or from a guru. So no contradiction

at all. Gautama did visit a couple of respected gurus of the day, but there was nothing spiritually real there that he sensed.

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, Buddha discovered the ancient dharma path through recalling his past lives. Then he applied that view in the third watch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

I believe the use of the word Buddhism is quite complicated and polemic as it is a western neologism. What Buddhism are we talking about? Dzogchen differs a lot from some schools.

The path taught by the Buddha leads one beyond concepts too. We can't assume Sadharma is Buddhadharma. It's its fruit. Sadharma is beyond "Buddhism" too, and it's the fruit of practicing Buddhadharma.

Don't assume I don't like Jim Valby. I don't know him, but knowing he is a cherished disciple of my lama, I naturally feel respect for his methods, although in this particular case it is not the sort of presentation that rings my bell (the title, note, because the rest I don't know). I'm just trying to dissect Namdrol's position, as for him too I feel great respect. It's not a matter of confrontation, but of my own understanding. It may even be the case that one of them is wrong (or not). It really doesn't matter much to me. I have great respect for both (although I owe Namdrol much more, since I've been learning from his explanations for a long time now).

Malcolm wrote:

I know Jim quite well. We are friends. He lives about 6 miles from my house.

But I am not addressing his teachings in particular. I was addressing this mistaken notion that many people have that Dzogchen can be delinked from Buddhism. It can't. It does not work. Dzogchen only makes sense in light of Buddhism as a whole.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

To say that Shakyamuni did not teach Dzogchen means that the words never left his lips while there was a Shakyamuni Buddha living in Jambudvipa.

Mariusz said:

This seems to be too radical statement and need to be historically "proofed". Can you

source any sutra/tantra/terma for this "never"?

Moreover, can you proof historically:

- the supreme Nirmanakaya Shakyamuni lips were nor ordinary as human and have limitless qualities
- there are also mind and symbol transmission of Dzogchen that could be taught by Shakyamuni
- students of Supreme Nirmanakaya are limitless and not only human (as I posted using Yogacara argument)

Malcolm wrote:

Let us put it this way -- there is no record of a nirmanakāya known as Shakyamuni teaching Dzogchen. None of the Dzogchen teachings that we have presently came from Shakyamuni. They all, every last one, come from the nirmanakāya known as Garab Dorje.

Garab Dorje is the predicted teacher of Dzogchen, not Shakyamuni.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Kyosan said:

I agree that if another religion doesn't lead to purification it won't be the same as Buddhism, but there can be another religion that leads to purification.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if that religion teaches dependent origination as well as emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Without Buddhism?

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

That's the way I see it. Your feedback will be appreciated.

DN

Malcolm wrote:

A Dzogchen without Buddhism is impossible for the simple reason that Dzogchen is a method of becoming a Buddha and nothing else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: To cultivate good: non-evil, non-unwholesome?

Content:

starter said:

Hello Teachers/Friends,

I've been wondering about the real meaning of the "good"/"wholesome" which we should cultivate according to the teaching of the Buddhas:

The Teaching of The Buddhas

Not to do evil,

To cultivate good [the Chinese translation: to do all the good],

To purify one's mind –

This is the Teaching of the Buddhas

-- Dhammapada 183

After studying the Buddha's teaching, especially the Noble eight-fold path, I came to the understanding that the "good"/"wholesome" the Buddhas would like us to cultivate is non-evil/non-unwholesome (non-sensuality/non-greed, non-ill will/non-aversion, non-cruelty, non- wrong speech/action/livelihood...) instead of doing all the good like a world saver. If my understanding is correct, then I worry about the Chinese translation/interpretation/practice of "To do all the good" instead of "To cultivate non-evil/non-unwholesome".

I'd like to know your opinion about it. Metta to all,

Starter

Malcolm wrote:

I think good here means the opposite of the ten non-virtuous deeds i.e. not killing, sexual misconduct, and stealing; speaking truthfully, gently, purposefully, and without calumny; and to avoid thoughts of malice, greed and ignorance.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Need help identifying deity

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think it is a Chinese Forgery. The deity seems to be a version of Guru Dragpo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

PMTF said:

(1) it does not accord with logic or reality;

(2) it finds fault with those who are faultless in terms of their representation of Shakyamuni Buddha.

I would suggest we be humble enough to acknowledge the spirit & compassion of the cultural Buddhist religion is broad minded enough to include teachings the Buddha himself did not teach or teachings that do not represent his central message.

Dear Namdrol

The above articulates what I am trying to say.

I am forbidden to disagree with your point of view?

Malcolm wrote:

It is easy to say something does not accord with logic or reality and refuse to explain anything. Point one simply is a claim. Ok, you have made an unsubstantiated claim.

Vasubandhu clearly states that whatever accords with dependent origination, etc., can be accepted as "buddhavacana" even if not spoken by Shakyamuni.

However, some narrow-minded people make assertions such as "Dzogchen is not buddhist because it was not taught by Shakyamuni Buddha." Other narrow minded people say "Anuttarayoga tantra is not buddhist because it was not taught by the Buddha", etc. .Still other narrow minded people say "Mahāyāna was not taught by by the Buddha", etc.

Yet in each case, Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna and Dzogchen are successively held by their adherent not only to hold the central message of Buddhism, but illustrate the most essential and salient part of Buddhist teachings not expressed in "lower" yānas. Of course, these adherents can also be accused of narrow mindedness too (even if they are correct).

So, yes, there are narrow minded people who reject teachings based on biased criteria. And for that they are at fault.

As Shantideva points out, the ultimate of the lower system is the conventional of the higher system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

In general, the point of view of narrow minded people is that if something is not taught by Shakyamuni Buddha, it is not the teaching of the Buddha.

PMTF said:

Dear Namdrol

The spirit of Buddhism is not about fault-finding. Buddhism, as a spiritual & religious vehicle for the diversity of humanity, has certainly evolved since Shakyamuni Buddha, to accommodate the needs of the human & cultural diversity. Most good Buddhists accept this. Most good & well-meaning Buddhists do not find fault with this.

But, to assert:...the point of view of narrow minded people is that if something is not taught by Shakyamuni Buddha, it is not the teaching of the Buddha... falls down in two ways:

(1) it does not accord with logic or reality;

(2) it finds fault with those who are faultless in terms of their representation of Shakyamuni Buddha.

I would suggest we be humble enough to acknowledge the spirit & compassion of the cultural Buddhist religion is broad minded enough to include teachings the Buddha himself did not teach or teachings that do not represent his central message.

Namaste

Malcolm wrote:

What are you trying to say?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

Hey bro Im just posting what Nyshol Khenpo said Im not implying any fault of yours.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the point of view of narrow minded people is that if something is not taught by Shakyamuni Buddha, it is not the teaching of the Buddha.

Nyoshul Khen's approach is a bandaid applied to Nyingma Hermeneutics to avoid Gelug refutation. He is basically claiming -- since the dharmakāya of all buddhas is the same, any teaching of Samantabhadra is a teaching of Shakyamuni Buddha. The converse would also have to be true, since Garab Dorje is a nirmanakāya, Shakyamuni's teaching of Vinaya is also Garab Dorje's teaching. Thus, this idea is only formally true -- it is not historically true.

For example, both Shakyamuni and Garab Dorje are nirmanakāyas of Vajradhara. Vajradhara is an emanation of Samantabhadra. But Shakyamuni and Garab Dorje are not the same person. They lived in different bodies, at different times, and taught different teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

tamdrin said:

According to Nyoshul Khenpo,

"Samantabhadra and SHakyamuni are both aspects of a single state of Buddhahood. This buddhahood in the context of dharmakaya is Samantabhadra; in the context of the sambhogakaya, it is Vajradhara; and in the context of nirmanakaya, it is Shakyamuni. And so we need to understand the three kayas as inseparable. Otherwise we could reach some kind of erroneous conclusion, such as, "Dzogchen is not the teaching of the Buddha Shakyamuni." Misconceptions such as this develop out of ignorance of this inseparability of the three kayas"

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, not all Nirmanakāyas give the same teachings. For example, Anuttarayoga tantra will not be taught during the dispensation of Maitreya, so they say. Vipasi, Sikhin, Krakucchamunda are not mentioned in the lineage of teachers of Dzogchen -- and yet they too have all three kāyas. And yet Kashyapa and Shakyamuni Buddha are.

To say that Shakyamuni did not teach Dzogchen means that the words never left his lips while there was a Shakyamuni Buddha living in Jambudvīpa.

Kashyapa actually taught Dzogchen, Shakyamuni predicted Dzogchen. None of the other past buddhas are mentioned at all in that lineage.

So I don't accept the fault you are implying (i.e. that I am suffering from a misconception

about the inseparability of the three kāyas). On the contrary, you are not making a proper distinction between the five certainties possessed by Sambhogakāyas and the lack of those five certainties for Nirmanakāyas (time, place, teacher, retinue, and teaching).

Incidentally, it is also the position of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu that Shakyamuni never taught Dzogchen. His role in being mentioned as one of the twelve teachers of Dzogchen is a result of his having predicted the effortless vehicle. But he did not teach it, according to ChNN. I concur since in general the nirmanakāya for Dzogchen is Garab Dorje, and not Shakyamuni.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

The practice I mentioned above is very attainable. No point in being a Buddhist otherwise. Milarepa was in his forties when he met Marpa. Mipham Gonpo in his eighties when he met Vairocana. So, never too late.

gregkavarnos said:

If the practice was so attainable I imagine they would have all the monks in the monasteries doin' it just to bring down the overhead costs! (and Tummo, as well to, reduce heating costs)

You are right about the age thing though... it's definitely got (much) more to do with how much I am willing to exert myself rather than how old I am.

PS Four ounces (112 gram for us metric types) is an incredibly small dose when it comes to a meat portion, especially over the period of a week! I am surprised at how "strong" meat is as a medicine. I take it that it's 4 ounce without bone and fat?

Malcolm wrote:

Four ounces a week is sufficient if you need meat in your diet. Fatty is good. Of course, it depends on constitution. Also, when meat is used medicinally, like any other sman -- it fast tracks through one's metabolic pathways very rapidly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Creating medicines and elixers

Content:

Rael said:

Namdrol i hope you let loose in this section with some secrets and medicines maybe we can all try out ourselves.....

Namdrol said:

Like Ayurveda, the most important features of Tibetan Medicine are diet and lifestyle. There are secrets in Tibetan Medicine, but they are mostly related to creating mercury sulfide compounds. While the process is described in detail, still you need to have personal instruction. I know a couple of doctors who know how to make so called detoxified mercury, but it takes a long time and many people working together to do it safely.

You should examine David Gordon White's book on Indian Alchemy. You will find it interesting.

Rael said:

Ta for the tip...

methinks if you show us your hand we will find you know about alchemy

there are mercury stones that some create ...the essence of mercury etc....yikes....but you can blow yourself up and the neighborhood trying to distill it....

Malcolm wrote:

I find things like Spagyrics interesting and plan on doing some elementary distillations of oil and hydrosols this summer. We can thank Jabir for inventing perfume, and you will be interested to learn there is a system of completion stage yoga which was brought to Tibet in the 16th century by one Vajranatha which claims to originate with Jabir.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Will said:

Pema Rigzen: Not sure how anything I said could seem to suggest I thought otherwise. Or maybe you're suggesting that some beings might just spontaneously become Bodhisattvas on their own outside of any connection to a Buddha's Dharma. Is that what you're suggesting?

I was responding, in the main, to your notion of "as defined by Mahayana doctrine". There are ages when there is no such doctrine, nor Theravada, nor any school of Buddhism. So Namdrol's point about compassion is important. There must be some powerful wish within a person that leads to actions, when there is no teachings of a Buddha around, that lead that one to strive to help others beyond one lifetime. Whether that inner drive is based on some old vasanas from previous contact with a Buddha or his teachings, I do not know. Vasubandhu & Nagarjuna (and others) have laid out the

root causes & conditions for one's original bodhicitta vow or aspiration, but no time right now to look them up. Memory says that compassion for others is the best motive, but other motives can result in bodhisattva-hood.

Malcolm wrote:

Nagarjuna states in the Mula that since suchness of phenomena is always present, there is always a basis for the arising of buddhas, even when there is no buddha present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

well, eskimos, mongolians, Tibetans, many Northern Europeans, etc. you might be surprised at the large numbers of people who have evolved with a high percentage of animal protein in their diet. I am quite certain these people really need some quantity (not large) of meat in their diets to be healthy.

kirtu said:

In general how much meat is needed by these peoples to remain healthy? I know this is impossible to quantify but in general could you feel comfortable saying something like the average Northern European needs to eat a small steak every month for optimal health? Could you posit a very general rule of thumb on this matter?

My former Taoist teacher (a Westerner) was told by his teacher (a well known Taoist Chinese martial artist) to eat some meat every once in a while for years. He didn't follow this advice (very uncharacteristic for him as he usually followed everything his teacher told him) until one day at a party he sort of accidentally ate some lamb (actually his teacher basically fixed this situation) and the effect on him was so galvanizing that he felt like he was superman. So he now follows his teacher's advice even on his diet.

This story did arise in the context of karmic consequences of meat eating many years ago (I haven't studied with my former Taoist teacher for at least 15 years now) but the Taoist view on this is different from the Chinese Mahayana view to begin with.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Four ounces of meat a week would be sufficient as a medicinal dose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

tamdrin said:

Still it would be hard to understand great compassion without the blessings of a highly realized being.

the buddha shakymuni met the Buddha Shakyamuni? That is interesting...

Malcolm wrote:

right, our Buddha Shakyamuni is the second of the name.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Creating medicines and elixers

Content:

Rael said:

Namdrol i hope you let loose in this section with some secrets and medicines maybe we can all try out ourselves.....

.

Malcolm wrote:

Like Ayurveda, the most important features of Tibetan Medicine are diet and lifestyle. There are secrets in Tibetan Medicine, but they are mostly related to creating mercury sulfide compounds. While the process is described in detail, still you need to have personal instruction. I know a couple of doctors who know how to make so called detoxified mercury, but it takes a long time and many people working together to do it safely.

You should examine David Gordon White's book on Indian Alchemy. You will find it interesting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Or maybe you're suggesting that some beings might just spontaneously become Bodhisattvas on their own outside of any connection to a Buddha's Dharma. Is that what you're suggesting?

Namdrol said:

Happened to the Buddha, so why not?

tamdrin said:

No, Buddha had made vows to previous Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, according to Sonam Tsemo, what actually happened was this: when the Buddha was a hell being he aroused great compassion for other hell beings, and asked the yamas whether he could take on the sufferings of other hell beings. In doing, after his head caught fire and he died, he was born first as a deva of Trāyāstrimśā heaven, then as the son of the a potter in Jambudvipa. At that time, he met the ancient Buddha Shakyamuni and, offering that Buddha some porridge, generated bodhicitta.

So while one may technically claim that one must by necessity generate bodhicitta in the presence of a buddha in the past, the necessary precondition for bodhicitta is compassion, and it is for that reason that Candrakīrti cites compassion as the cause of all bodhisattvas.

Whether the above events are true or are a parable is irrelevant -- the point is that compassion is the cause of bodhicitta and so therefore it is possible to say that one can become a bodhisattva without having ever met a Buddha. I would rate compassion as more important than a vow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Pema Rigdzin said:

Or maybe you're suggesting that some beings might just spontaneously become Bodhisattvas on their own outside of any connection to a Buddha's Dharma. Is that what you're suggesting?

Malcolm wrote:

Happened to the Buddha, so why not?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2011 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

Changing one's diet will not lead to realization. If it did, all vegetarians would be buddhas.

gregkavarnos said:

Who said it did?

Malcolm wrote:

The practice I mentioned above is very attainable. No point in being a Buddhist otherwise. Milarepa was in his forties when he met Marpa. Mipham Gonpo in his eighties when he met Vairocana. So, never too late.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

yes, if you practice properly, then you can reduce your attachment to food, eventually you can do the rasāyana of space. Then you won't need anything but a little water, like Nyagla Pema Dudul.

gregkavarnos said:

Don't know if I can get that far this lifetime, I left Buddhist practice a little too late (spent a fair bit of time on sex, drugs and rock'n'roll though, does this count as Buddhist practice?) At this point in time I would be happy to be able to generate the favorable conditions so that, at the very least, I will be able to remain a vegetarian 'til the end of this lifetime. I like to set realistic goals for my practice, ones that are based on my current level of understanding and practice. It lessens the feelings of disillusionment that may arise due to failure to achieve stated goals, feelings that can easily lead to abandonment of the path.

Malcolm wrote:

Changing one's diet will not lead to realization. If it did, all vegetarians would be buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Creating medicines and elixers

Content:

Rael said:

now in the actual making of your medicines do you combine the process with that path...

Malcolm wrote:

No, only in the rite to empower medicines. The process of the rites of blessing medicines is part of the path.

Being a doctor itself is the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine vs Ayurveda

Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

Hi,

Being located inbetween China and India, Tibetan Medicine makes use of a range of medicinal substances, indigenous, Chinese and Indian.

There are other differences in how some of the treatments are now done, but the differences above seem to be the most prominent.

Wishing you all the best.

Malcolm wrote:

Not a bad summary. There are also differences in Anatomy -- Tibetan Medicine has many influences from Galen; and through Galen, influences that go back as far as Hippocrates.

Whereas internal anatomy in Ayurveda is not terribly well developed, it is very well developed in Tibetan Medicine. Further, since Tibetan Medicine is also a tantric system, it is integrated completely with Yuthog Nyinthig (as well as other related systems), and as such has deep connections with the teaching of the great perfection.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Creating medicines and elixirs

Content:

Rael said:

How much of this is the same in Tibetan medicines and it's production of medicines and elixirs?

Malcolm wrote:

In Tibetan medicine, we use rites to empower the medicine. In general, making medicine itself is not regarded as a spiritual metaphor.

Being a doctor however is regarded as a deeply spiritual occupation. The best medicines come from those doctors with the best Buddhist practice.

N

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2011 at 1:05 AM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:
Regardless of HH's level of realization, it can hardly be said he consumes meat in excess.

Malcolm wrote:
I am quite sure that from now on all the websites patronized by followers of Voldemort, it will be asserted that Harry Potter is oppressing the practice of Voldemort because HP eats a little meat while traveling around representing Hogwarts's Government in Exile.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 11:58 PM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:

Yeshe said:
I implied it was a daft remark to generalise about Tibetans in this way, and used the example of HHDL's meat eating as 'reductio ad absurdum'.

Malcolm wrote:
Not very clearly. And for the record, I stated that cultures where lots of red meat is commonly eaten in toto tend to be more aggressive cultures. I was not singling Tibetans out for special treatment.

We Americans are also very aggressive -- red meat is a main staple in our diet.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 11:54 PM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:

Yeshe said:
Well here it is, together with Namdrol's denial. He talks of Tibetans per se, and by pointing out that this must also mean HHDL as a 'reduction ad absurdum' response I received a flurry of ad homs from those who had previously wanted to bash Pabongka and thought it was a good time to put the boot in while I was asleep.

Quote Namdrol:

ASSERTION

"I merely pointed out to you that Tibet has a fairly violent culture -- there is no doubt in my mind that their excess fondness for lamb and yak contributes overall to the cultural violence which is fairly common in Tibet"

AND THE DENIAL, WITH ATTITUDE:

(Yeshe wrote: So you contradict yourself. HHDL says he needs meat yet you claim he is not affected by it . Illogical as you just claimed Tibetan violence was partly due to meat. If he needs it then he is subject to its effects .)

"You were not paying attention -- I pointed out that excesses of meat could cause a humoral imbalance of pitta. So can excesses of chili peppers. Tibetans in general eat excessive amounts of meat. I have been there. I know. So, rather than finding fault where none exists, read more carefully."

I read it carefully alright, Namdrol: "their excess fondness for lamb and yak contributes overall to the cultural violence.."

Just clearing the decks as I leave.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, "contributes" does not mean "sole cause".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Medicine subforum

Content:

retrofuturist said:

Greetings,

I suspect that if there started to be subjects created on the topic of Tibetan Medicine, the administrators would be more inclined to consider such a request to accommodate such topics. To date though, I've hardly seen it discussed at all.

Metta,

Retro.

Malcolm wrote:

Supply creates demand. Since I am an actual doctor of Tibetan Medicine, I think I can provide assistance here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Divination

Content:

Inge said:

How much weight should one put on the result of Lama Dawa's divinations?

I was told that I should practice the Dudjom Tersar lineage, and that my perfect guru is Lama Tharchin Rinpoche. Would it be most sensible to follow this advice?

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on how much faith you have in Lama Dawa's mo.

Of course, there is nothing wrong with either Dudjom Tersar or Lama Tharchin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

pemachophel said:

Inge,

How do you know the condition(s) is/are caused by nagas?

Inge said:

I was told so by Lama Dawa Rinpoche.

Are such fungal infections always caused by nagas?

Malcolm wrote:

As I said above, not always. The main cause of illness is the three doshas. There are four contributing factors, diet, lifestyle, season and spirit provocations.

Another thing you can do is try to find the "five nectars" herbal bath.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

Namdrol said:

Tibetan medicine is very balanced about it. The name of spirit illnesses is Tibetan is termed རྒྱུ་རྟགས་གཏོན་ནད་ i.e. imputed spirit illnesses. I.e. when you have run out of other causal factors, then provocations are one's last resort diagnosis.

Adamantine said:

Do Tibetan amchis ever use MOs to help with diagnosis?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But spirit illnesses are generally diagnosed with elemental calculation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Namdrol said:

Nirmanakāyas are emanations i.e. they only are a facet of full awakening display to sentient beings based on their karma. Thus the teachings they bestow are also based on the karma of those sentient beings.

Heruka said:

does tsal have a hand in this?

Malcolm wrote:

rtal is the basis for the arising of pure emanations, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

tamdrin said:

Tibetans have spirits as an explanation for almost everything.. There is even a god(s) that makes the sun and moon work lol..

Namdrol said:

That is a quite an exaggeration.

tamdrin said:

I think both Tibetan Doctors and Western Doctors need to arrive at a balanced perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan medicine is very balanced about it. The name of spirit illnesses in Tibetan is termed རྒྱན་ཉགས་གདོན་ནད་ i.e. imputed spirit illnesses. I.e. when you have run out of other causal factors, then provocations are one's last resort diagnosis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Kyosan said:

have discovered the same truth as Buddha did and are using what they feel are the best expedients.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you have to decide what truth Buddha discovered, and then compare.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

So you contradict yourself. HHDL says he needs meat yet you claim he is not affected by it . Illogical as you just claimed Tibetan violence was partly due to meat . If he needs it then he is subject to its effects .

Malcolm wrote:

You were not paying attention -- I pointed out that excesses of meat could cause a humoral imbalance of pitta. So can excesses of chili peppers.

Tibetans in general eat excessive amounts of meat. I have been there. I know.

HHDL does not eat meat when in Dharamsala. He only eats meat when he travels. His kitchen is vegetarian.

And, what affects ordinary people adversely often has no effect of realized people. HHDL is certainly the latter and not the former.

So, rather than finding fault where none exists, read more carefully.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: Vermont's House Passes Single-Payer Health Care Bill

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Go Vermont!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

tamdrin said:

Tibetans have spirits as an explanation for almost everything.. There is even a god(s) that makes the sun and moon work lol..

Malcolm wrote:

That is a quite an exaggeration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

pemachophel said:

Inge,

How do you know the condition(s) is/are caused by nagas?

Malcolm wrote:

All of this information is included in the four medicine tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

i can't stand by and just watch you tell us that Tibetans are violent race all due to their meat eating habits....

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say they were violent because they ate meat. What I said was that meat eating, in excess, makes people more aggressive. This is actually taught in the sutras that people bring to bear to criticize the habit of eating meat. If you read back in the thread, you will read some of those statements.

The sutras however do not really give a precise reason why this is so. The reason is that anger cuts the root of compassion. The meat the people tend to like are warming meats like lamb, buffalo, or aged meats and so on. All of these things reinforce pitta dosha, which increases the klesha of devsha i.e. hatred/anger. When the klesha of anger increases, it is more difficult to give rise to compassion.

You brought in the example of Tibetans.

I merely pointed out to you that Tibet has a fairly violent culture -- there is no doubt in my mind that their excess fondness for lamb and yak contributes overall to the cultural violence which is fairly common in Tibet. But it is not the sole reason, the only reason, or even the main reason. It is one contributing factor. Meat eating is also a contributing factor in the aggressive nature of Western Culture especially Northern European culture.

We are what we eat, to invoke a cliché.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Abolish Money for Buddha's favors....

Content:

Rael said:

and second....do you think it is time for like the clergy of all Buddhist sects to stop accepting money for Buddha's favours...

Malcolm wrote:

No one accepts money for "Buddha's favors".

Anyone who thinks they are giving money to a temple, etc., for "favors" is mistaken. No favor will be forthcoming. It does not work like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

the man is saying a people is violent due to meat eating....

Namdrol said:

The same is true of hot peppers.

Nangwa said:

bummer.

How do we determine appropriate amounts of certain foods in order to maintain balance?

Are there simple guides or does each individual need personal prescriptions etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, Ayurvedic practitioners are a bit more tuned into Western diet than Tibetan doctors-- they have I think better general practices regarding diet and behavior on an outer level. Tibetan Medicine's strong point is inner tantric related stuff.

Of course, if you are healthy, you adapt your diet according to season and tastes. In the fall one begins to eat more warming, nutritious food emphasizing sweet, salty, sour through the winter, then in spring begin to add more bitter and astringent food for cleansing, relax the nutritious, warming and sweet foods, etc. and in the summer eating cool, sweet, sour foods, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan medicine and fungal infection of the skin

Content:

Inge said:

Do you know if Tibetan medicine has a specific treatment for fungal infections of the skin (athletes foot, jocks itch, ringworm, etc.) that are caused by the nagas?

Malcolm wrote:

Most nāgā illness are connected with lymph. However, generally for what you are talking about, Tibetan medicine would use sulfur based and orpiment based herbal powders on the skin. So, in this day and age, it would be advisable if this is serious condition to go to a dermatologist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

the man is saying a people is violent due to meat eating....

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is right. I am asserting that red meat, in excess, increases people's pitta dosha, and reinforces their klesha of hatred and anger. The same is true of hot peppers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

anger is such a horrid thing to see in type....

Malcolm wrote:

I am not angry with you, not in the least. My recommendation to you is for your benefit, not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

alpha said:

So all these lamas and teachers who give teachings indiscriminately ,publicly and regardless of time ,place,retinue,teachings are in fact nirmanakayas?

And the ones who give restricted teachings based on time, place, teacher, retinue and teaching are sambogakaya??

Alpha

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

As for Shabkar, he was not an ordinary person -- I doubt he was at risk from starving at any time. Same goes for Nyala Pema Duddul.

gregkavarnos said:

I consider all these extraordinary people merely ordinary people that make extraordinary efforts. That gives me a sense of "hope" that I too will one day be able to become extraordinary.

Malcolm wrote:

yes, if you practice properly, then you can reduce your attachment to food, eventually you can do the rasāyana of space. Then you won't need anything but a little water, like Nyagla Pema Dudul.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

. It also makes people very aggressive. We can easily see that cultures where people eat a lot of red meat, cow, yak, etc., that people are more aggressive, etc.

Rael said:

i'm really lousy at being tactful... my debate nuance is best served in deletion...lol....

Malcolm wrote:

You need to learn how to write and post without emotion, and without making pointless ad hominem remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

LastLegend said:

Most of the energy from food that we eat is spent on thinking or illusion. Monks only eat one meal per day.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is not exactly true. Most Tibetan monks eat three squares.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

His Holiness does not come off as aggressive....A Rinpoche i was taught under grew up with herders in urt tents and lived off this stuff all his youth...the guy does not come across as aggressive...

I know a lot of meat eaters who are not aggressive at all...my wife eats tons of it as does me mum and neither are anything but wall flowers socially....welcome mats have been used to describe them....

Malcolm wrote:

You know, in Tibet, when Lamas give advice to Tibetans, especially in Eastern Tibet, they

frequently recommend in their Dharma talks that Tibetans should avoid killing each other.

When is the last time you heard a Lama in the west telling us we should avoid murdering one another?

I have been in Tibet. I have seen how violent Tibetans can be, and how quickly Tibetans will turn to violence to settle disputes amongst themselves. And how proud of it they are, especially Khampas.

Many people are not aware of how violent the culture of Tibet actually is -- not to mention the horrendous way they treat animals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So I have not really changed my view that much. I still think that meat industry is an environmental disaster from every point of view. I still think that eating meat is over all a negative habit. Etc.

Well... truth is that I first heard of Shakbar through your "fanatical" diatribes on the correctness of vegetarian/vegan diets!

Malcolm wrote:

I definitely do not think vegan diet is good. To restrictive. Of course, we have to be mindful of where our dairy and honey comes from -- but their POV is too extreme in my opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

So I have not really changed my view that much. I still think that meat industry is an environmental disaster from every point of view. I still think that eating meat is over all a negative habit. Etc.

Well... truth is that I first heard of Shakbar through your "fanatical" diatribes on the correctness of vegetarian/vegan diets!

Malcolm wrote:

I definitely do not think vegan diet is good. Too restrictive. Of course, we have to be mindful of where our dairy and honey comes from -- but their POV is too extreme in my opinion.

As I have said, it is better to not eat meat. Eating meat is negative -- but what I do not accept is many fallacious consequences people dream up about meat eating.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2011 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

To give an example, pork greatly increases kapha (bad kan), therefore, it reinforces ignorance. It is commonly held that chicken and eggs increase desire; snake meat increases anger, and pork ignorance ala the diagrams of the six realms.

But in a general way, the three doshas increase the three kleshas, and the three kleshas support the three doshas.

Adamantine said:

Why would you ever want to eat any of these things, considering we are trying to go beyond these negative emotions? In tantric practices where you are transforming anger or desire would you want to increase the intensity of these emotions for fuel? I understand many yogis would only eat lamb meat, as it is one of the few meats that doesn't add to obscuration. . .

You say 'it is commonly held that'; but do you believe that eggs really increase desire?

Malcolm wrote:

When three doshas are in balance, they are also called dhatus in this sense, constituents. The health of our body is based on having a proper balance of the three dhatus -- when vata, pitta and kapha are balanced, we are healthy. So for example, if someone has a severe vata imbalance affecting the heart, one of the main remedies for this condition is a eaglewood formula that contains yak heart. It works beautifully. I have used this for patients experiencing severe heart issues connected with edema.

As far as lamb goes -- lamb or any food overused will lead to increased afflictions. In the case of lamb, it is very warming which is why Tibetans like it so much. Same with Yak.

Eggs are pure reproductive tissue. So, I think there is something present as a "prabhava" in eggs that does indeed increase desire when overused.

The main point I am making is that there is relationship between any food we eat and

the three doshas and three afflictions. To much red meat increases pitta dosha and vitiates blood -- leading to high blood pressure, heart attacks and so on. It also makes people very aggressive. We can easily see that cultures where people eat a lot of red meat, cow, yak, etc., that people are more aggressive, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Guru

Content:

Alaya7 said:

Can some one explain to me how the Guru pervades in all phenomena?

Thank you

Malcolm wrote:

Context please?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: All Sentient Beings are equal?

Content:

LastLegend said:

Are all sentient beings equal? Based on what are they equal?

Is possible to discuss this?

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by "equal"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Dexing said:

Your statements in these two cases seem contradictory. How do you reconcile the apparent discrepancies?

Malcolm wrote:

I used to be plagued by this issue as well. But then I realized -- we have the capacity (mostly undeveloped) to know the minds of others and communicate through the mind.

Consciousness is a field. It is one of the six aggregate fields that make up the universe i.e. the sadadhātu:

the field of earth
the field of water
the field of fire
the field of air
the field of space
the field of consciousness

Consciousness is limited only by the delusion of matter. In reality, one's mind has the capacity to be anywhere in the universe. Therefore, it does not matter where any sentient being may be located after that being leaves the body of this lifetime.

By thinking of that being and making a connection through certain mantras that directly spring from dharmatā, we create a positive cause for that sentient being to attain full awakening. This kind of method is a special feature of the teachings of the great perfection. You will not find this kind of teaching in other yanas. If our knowledge and wisdom are sufficiently developed, even mantras are unnecessary.

As a result, there are two benefits -- one, the mind of that being of the animal realms is benefitted. Second, their karmic body does not go completely to waste merely to feed others who are not on a path and have no concept of a path.

Everything in Dharma practice works because of the mind. When for example we do the Jvalamukha water tormā -- in reality pretas cannot drink water. But through our intention we bring them to mind and briefly influence their minds so that they see a stream of nectar with everything they could ever want contained in the water we pour from our hands.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

Different meats affect different doshas, as do different diets in general. For example, if one's diet is too poor, this leads to an increase of vata dosha (rlung) and correspondingly one experiences an increase of desire ('dod chags, rāga). Likewise, a diet that is too spicy, too much red meat, alcohol, etc, increases pita dosha (mkhris pa) and this reinforces hatred and anger.

In particular, if we are tantric or dzogchen practitioners, it is very important to understand our diet in terms of the three doshas and the remedies prescribed for them in various tantras and upadeshas.

Of course, if we are common Mahayana practitioners without any methods of

transformation, etc., then it is better we do not eat meat at all save conditions of illness.

Inge said:

Could you give advice for some introductory reading material about proper diet and the doshas?

Malcolm wrote:

You know, Norbu Rinpoche's book Birth, Living and Death presents these issues from the point of view of Tibetan Medicine.

To give an example, pork greatly increases kapha (bad kan), therefore, it reinforces ignorance. It is commonly held that chicken and eggs increase desire; snake meat increases anger, and pork ignorance ala the diagrams of the six realms.

But in a general way, the three doshas increase the three kleshas, and the three kleshas support the three doshas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Inge said:

All the stories we make about the sense-objects we experience, are they not just mere thoughts - fiction? Thinking that the meat on the plate came from such and such animal, who experienced such and such misery throughout its life, ending in such and such horrors in a slaughterhouse, is this not to add fantasy to perception?

I have once read that the actual reason for abstaining from meat is that its consumption leads to an increase of desire and anger. For those practitioners who skillfully apply the suitable methods from the path of transformation or the path of self-liberation, such increase of defilements should not be a problem. Is this correct?

Malcolm wrote:

Different meats affect different doshas, as do different diets in general. For example, if one's diet is too poor, this leads to an increase of vata dosha (rlung) and correspondingly one experiences an increase of desire ('dod chags, rāga). Likewise, a diet that is too spicy, too much red meat, alcohol, etc, increases pita dosha (mkhris pa) and this reinforces hatred and anger.

In particular, if we are tantric or dzogchen practitioners, it is very important to understand our diet in terms of the three doshas and the remedies prescribed for them in various tantras and upadeshas.

Of course, if we are common Mahayana practitioners without any methods of transformation, etc., then it is better we do not eat meat at all save conditions of illness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: How to overcome attachment to our partners?

Content:

wanderer said:

How to overcome attachment to our partner, lovers, wives and husbands? How to overcome fear of loss? How to overcome time of long separation and irrational doubts?

Malcolm wrote:

Contemplate death and impermanence.

Reflect on the fortune of a precious human birth.

Be grateful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Earthquake - Burma/Thailand border...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to the advice of the late Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, when natural disasters occur, the following verse of Sampa Lhundrupma should be recited:

ས་ཆུ་མེ་རླང་འབྱུང་བའི་བར་ཆད་ཀྱིས་མུ་ལམ་ཉེན་ཅིང་འཛིག་པའི་དུས་བྱུང་ཆེ་
ཡིད་གཉིས་ཐེ་ཚམ་མེད་པར་གསོལ་བ་འདེབས་ཏེ་རྒྱན་འབྱུང་བ་བཞི་ཡི་ལྷ་མོ་བཅས་
འབྱུང་བ་རང་སར་ཞི་བར་ཐེ་ཚམ་མེད་ཏེ་རྒྱན་པ་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་གནས་ལ་གསོལ་བ་འདེབས་
བསམ་པ་ལྷན་གྱིས་འགྲུབ་པར་བྱིན་གྱིས་རྒྱབ་སྐྱོར་

SA CHU ME LUNG JUNG WEY BAR CHEY KYI/

When the illusory body is endangered and a time of destruction occurs

GYU LUS NYEN CHING JIG PEY DU JUNG TSE

by obstacles of the elements of earth, water, fire and air;

YID NI THE TSOM MEY PAR SOL WA DEB

by offering a supplication without hesitation or doubt

ORGYEN JUNG WA ZHI YI LHA MOR CHEY

to Padmasambhava with the goddesses of the four elements

JUNG WA RANG SAR ZHI WAR THE TSOM MEY

without doubt the elements will be naturally pacified.

ORGYEN PADMA JUNG NEY LA SOL WA DEB

I supplicate Padmasambhava of Oddiyāna,

SAM PA LHUN GYI DRUB PAR JIN GYI LOB

bless us that our wishes be effortlessly accomplished!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Will said:

Before the Dalai Lama left Tibet he thought Buddhism was the "only true religion". But his attitude changed when he visited India in 1956. What happened in India? My visit to the Theosophical Society in Chennai (then Madras) left a powerful impression. There I was directly exposed to people, and to a movement, that attempted to bring together the wisdom of the world's spiritual traditions, as well as science... After more than three months in what was a most amazing country ... I was a changed man. I could no longer live in the comfort of an exclusivist standpoint that takes Buddhism to be the only true religion.
From Toward a True Kinship of Faiths

Many Western Buddhists have scorn for the Theosophical Society, founded by Upasika Blavatsky. The Presence looked a little deeper.

muni said:

In understanding is unconditioned love. Was so reflecting: If I am considering myself to be a buddhist and reject others approach to peace, what kind of narrow understanding I than have other than grasping to correct philosophical ideas, my opinion?

"Harmony among the major faiths has become an essential ingredient of peaceful coexistence in our world. From this perspective, mutual understanding among these traditions is not merely the business of religious believers - it matters for the welfare of humanity as a whole".

<http://dalailamacenter.org/blog-post/many-faiths-one-truth-dalai-lama> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Malcolm wrote:

What HHDL means is that among religions there is no shared authority, no central committee deciding for everyone what is true and what is false. Recognizing the subjective nature of religious opinion, HHDL offers a more secular view. This is correct. To protect everyone's liberty, it is necessary to subordinate religious views to secular law i.e. insist on separation of church and state.

Since there can be no agreement among various religions around which is the "true" religion -- tolerance is required. This however does not mean that if you are a Buddhist you are required to think that Christianity makes truth claims that are as valid as Buddhist truth claims. All that needs to be recognized is that all religions make truth

claims that cannot be verified by any mutually agreed upon standard.

So, I know for a fact that HHDL feels that Buddhism is the best religion. He also recognizes that this is just an opinion and insisting on this opinion to someone who does not share the same idea leads to strife and war. So rather than insisting that Buddhism is the best religion for everyone, he merely asserts it is the best religion for himself.

Then, when we cross that divide, we try to look at people from the point of view of their goodness. We try to meet people at that point.

Since we cannot make all religions the same, we need to recognize where it is that people are the same. Where they are the same is that they want happiness and freedom from suffering -- and religions evolve to provide those answers, differently for different people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

I heard some Buddhas do not teach tantras and so on, but this refers to the Nirmanakayas only I guess. It seems strange to me, if They are completely enlightened, not be different from other Buddhas, and the possibilities to teach in Samsara/Nirvana by means of 3 Kayas are limitless, why the need to hide suitable something, for example Dzogchen instructions? Whatever if mind, symbol or oral transmission of Dzogchen? I'm sure, according to the logic, Buddha Shakyamuni, by means of 3 Kayas, taught somewhere Dzogchen although suppose not in Human Realm.

Malcolm wrote:

The teachings a given nirmanakāya buddha teaches depends on the student. That is why it is taught that in contrast to the sambhogakāya five certainties (time, place, teacher, retinue and teaching) nirmanakāyas do not have certain time, place, teacher, retinue and teaching. For example, Sikhin Buddha never taught vinaya. He did not have a sangha of ordained bhiksus, etc.

Nirmanakāyas are emanations i.e. they only are a facet of full awakening display to sentient beings based on their karma. Thus the teachings they bestow are also based on the karma of those sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:26 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:
gregkavarnos said:
Dear namdrol,

You have posted a vast array of valid and pertinent points, before continuing I will draw your attention to the fact that I consider eating meat in order to overcome sickness/illness can be valid, but I want to ask a question (that of course you do not need to answer):

To me the points you are presenting here veer widely from the position you used to post on e-sangha where you quoted from practitioners like Shakbar, who out of his boundless compassion for all sentient beings reached the verge of death from starvation (a number of times) on the plateaus of Tibet, rather than consume the flesh of sentient beings; to your current more "practical" position, based on research from the Medicine Buddha Sutra (and other teachings obviously), where you believe that the flesh of sentient beings may be consumed for medical purposes.

I am not going to go into the karma vipakka of consuming flesh as I believe that the teachings of the Buddha (both in the Suuta and Sutra Pitaka) are quite clear.

My question is how much of this change in view rests on a wish to increase your capacity for boundless compassionate action and how much on a more (again logical) self-centred attempt to preserve this impemanent illusory body?

Malcolm wrote:
Hi Greg:

As for Shabkar, he was not an ordinary person -- I doubt he was at risk from starving at any time. Same goes for Nyala Pema Duddul.

You will recall I maintained quite consistently on e-sangha that meat as medicine was perfectly allowable.

So I have not really changed my view that much. I still think that meat industry is an environmental disaster from every point of view. I still think that eating meat is over all a negative habit. Etc.

What I was negating here was that meat-eating necessarily has a karma vipaka of killing.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 9:22 AM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:
Namdrol said:
Gotta love the internet, post on Dharmawheel for one day and two people in one day

call me a liar...

Adamantine said:

good thing you're not concerned about praise or blame!

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 8:45 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Gotta love the internet, post on Dharmawheel for one day and two people in one day call me a liar...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 8:03 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Kyosan said:

Here is venerable Chan master Hsu Yun. I feel a closeness to him because his works are one of the first things I read when I first became interested in Buddhism. He advocated vegetarianism and was a vegetarian himself. He lived from 1840 to 1959. He lived to the amazing age of 119 years so I guess being vegetarian didn't hurt his health.

Namdrol said:

Sure, and Chang Chub Dorje live to estimated 145 years, ate meat his whole life.

Kyosan said:

What I said is the truth. You are making things up. I encourage people to check for themselves and see who is telling the truth and who isn't. Google is your friend.

I'm not saying that master Hsu Yun lived to that age because he was vegetarian. Some people live long and healthy lives whether they are vegetarian or not. I don't think that being vegetarian as a big factor. Eating healthy is a factor, but both vegetarians and non-vegetarians can eat healthy.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, I was a little wrong, off by ten years.

Nyagla Changchub Dorje was a Tibetan doctor and tertön who lived near the Dege region of Tibet. He lived from 1826 to 1961. His main student in the west is Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Lama Wangdor also took teachings from him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

There is no fallacy - you are creating a premise in assuming that the plants are grown with harmful chemicals etc. whereas it is a certainty that all meat requires death, and almost always in the human context, deliberate killing for that purpose.

Malcolm wrote:

It is always certain that modern agriculture requires harming millions upon millions of creatures, both deliberately in the case of pesticides, and unintentionally.

Yeshe said:

Earlier in the thread you claimed intention (re. karma) was a key. So how do you now arrive at the conclusion that the intention to feed yourself is unconnected to the intention to eat a being reared and killed to satisfy your demands, and that this is not worse than a vegetarian diet.

Malcolm wrote:

No being has ever been reared and killed to satisfy my demands. Ever.

Yeshe said:

You also want to tie the plant based diet to your assumptions about it, deliberately killing with pesticides etc, as this suits your argument. I know no vegetarians who wish for beings to die in order to feed them.

Malcolm wrote:

And yet, they regularly support an agriculture system where millions of beings are killed deliberately in order to meet their demands for food. Blindness at best.

Yeshe said:

I know no meat-eaters who can think otherwise - they desire a killing as it is the only way to create the food they crave.

Malcolm wrote:

False connection -- I don't desire any animals to be killed at all. At all. Yet they are, all

the time. Whether I eat a little meat or not is irrelevant. Your imputation of intention is based on a false premise i.e. "If you eat meat, you necessarily desire that an animal has been killed for you."

Yeshe said:

I feel you are also incorrect in that the meat is free of any connection to the consciousness of the being it once was.

Malcolm wrote:

Once there is no vāyu in that body, there is no consciousness. Consciousness is inextricably bound to vāyu (rlung). Once an animal has been butchered, etc., that sentient being's consciousness is not longer connected with that body in anyway.

Yeshe said:

You cannot be sure at what point the bardo being is truly separated from its former life - up to 49 days I believe, during which that bardo being can be very much attached to its former 'form' and need help through Phowa to move on.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you can. You can be absolutely certain. If an animal or a human dies on its own, within three days or less its inner breath will have ceased. At that point, its consciousness will have left its body; in the case of a butchered animal, as soon as it is eviscerated and its heart is removed. The only beings exempt from this in our dimension are yogis in thugdam.

Once you are in the bardo, you are no longer connected with your former body. Full stop. You have a new body, since you are now a ghandharva. The gandharva might linger in the place where it died, but not in the body it has separated from and left behind.

In any event, "49" days is a symbolic number. There is no guarantee that any ghandarva will remain in the bardo for 49 days.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Kyosan said:

Here is venerable Chan master Hsu Yun. I feel a closeness to him because his works are one of the first things I read when I first became interested in Buddhism. He advocated vegetarianism and was a vegetarian himself. He lived from 1840 to 1959. He lived to the amazing age of 119 years so I guess being vegetarian didn't hurt his health.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, and Chang Chub Dorje live to estimated 145 years, ate meat his whole life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

LastLegend said:

Ignorance conditioned what according to Dependent Origination? If not self and others?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not that ignorance. That is afflicted ignorance. The knowledge obscuration of ignorance is the mistaken apprehension of an identity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Namdrol said:

No, the goal is to be free of obscurations of affliction (in common with Theravada) and knowledge.

LastLegend said:

What is the cause of obscurations of affliction? Is arrogance a part of this cause?

Malcolm wrote:

The knowledge obscuration of ignorance, primarily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Mahayana Compassion?

Content:

alasdairye said:

Something I've wondered about,

Since Mahayana Buddhism places firm emphasis on compassion, why don't we see monks and mahayana buddhists rush to disaster sites, doing voluntary work to help others? Why only meditation and cultivation to create this mind only "Bodhicitta"? Is this true compassion? When we compare this to Christians who go all out to help disaster victims, 3rd world countries?

I'm not only talking about organisations here, I'm also talking about YOU.

Namo Amitufo!

Malcolm wrote:

I can set you up with some people in Haiti, if you want to walk the walk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

I think you are missing the point. There is nothing in the world that cannot be medicine for some illness somewhere, if you know how to use it.

N

Yeshe said:

No, on the contrary, I think that just because something can be used for medicine, even if effective, it does not mean that we should use it. My guess is that the tigers massacred for Chinese medicine may agree.

The same argument obtains with our sources of food.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not medicine. That is superstition (tigers, etc, poached for male potency formulas in China).

Agreed, people should start growing more of their own food to limit the harm caused by industrial agriculture, both organic and non-organic, to "pests" and to the environment as a whole.

However, in my pervious post I was addressing the fallacies inherent in asserting that a modern vegetarian diet is inherently "more compassionate" than a diet in which some meat is consumed. There are people who think that we should just wear only plastic (whoops,BP), or soy based "plastics (Whoops, Monsanto), etc.

Of course, if we abandoned milk and dairy there are also consequences. Animals that humans don't eat wind up on extinction lists sooner or later.

Personally, I think we need deep ecological solutions to these issues, managed non-catastrophic scaling back of human populations to a hundred million would make this world a much nicer place. If we don't manage it, catastrophe will, sooner or later.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

tamdrin said:

did buddha intend for everyone to become "Buddhists" ???

Malcolm wrote:

In general, yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

No traditional medicine should be frozen, and should always consider contemporary availability.

Namdrol said:

Guess I have more confidence in rishis than scientists.

Yeshe said:

If an Ayurvedic practitioner went into the forest and discovered a plant which would cure a headache he would use it.

You are surely not suggesting that he should ignore it. If that was the approach, they would make scant progress.

Equally, if a 'scientist' discovers a plant-based cure for a headache (aspirin) the Ayurvedic practitioner should close their minds?

By all means have faith in Rishis but don't deny them the opportunity to continue their learning. When, exactly should they decide that they know everything and close their minds to new cures?

In terms of what humans are intended to eat or use as medication, I would hope that the over-arching consideration in all such choices would be Compassion. Should an Indian or Tibetan medical practitioner really be so arrogant as to assume they know everything? After all, what is a traditional healer in search of natural medicines other than a scientist?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not suggesting that we turn our backs on modern medicine. But it has serious limitations.

As far as plant based medicines go -- they are wonderful of course. We use more plants

in Tibetan medicine than meat.

I think you are missing the point. There is nothing in the world that cannot be medicine for some illness somewhere, if you know how to use it.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

LastLegend said:

We Buddhists often possess the attitude of Mahayana versus Theravada as one is superior to the other. Surely we can extend this attitude to non-Buddhist also.

Namdrol said:

Depends on what result one wants. Non-Buddhist religions do not result in Buddhahood, it is not their goal. Buddhahood is not the goal of Theravada either.

LastLegend said:

Is the goal not to break the barrier of self and others as a Buddhist?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the goal is to be free of obscurations of affliction (in common with Theravada) and knowledge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

LastLegend said:

We Buddhists often possess the attitude of Mahayana versus Theravada as one is superior to the other. Surely we can extend this attitude to non-Buddhist also.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what result one wants. Non-Buddhist religions do not result in Buddhahood, it is not their goal. Buddhahood is not the goal of Theravada either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism: Only True Religion

Content:

Will said:

Before the Dalai Lama left Tibet he thought Buddhism was the "only true religion". But his attitude changed when he visited India in 1956. What happened in India? My visit to the Theosophical Society in Chennai (then Madras) left a powerful impression. There I was directly exposed to people, and to a movement, that attempted to bring together the wisdom of the world's spiritual traditions, as well as science... After more than three months in what was a most amazing country ... I was a changed man. I could no longer live in the comfort of an exclusivist standpoint that takes Buddhism to be the only true religion.
From Toward a True Kinship of Faiths

Many Western Buddhists have scorn for the Theosophical Society, founded by Upasika Blavatsky. The Presence looked a little deeper.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by "true".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

No traditional medicine should be frozen, and should always consider contemporary availability.

Malcolm wrote:

Guess I have more confidence in rishis than scientists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

If someone had a digestive problem, if a goat was tethered in front of them, I wonder how many would ask for its slaughter 'for them'.

Malcolm wrote:

No buddhist of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

I guess it comes down to 'need'. The peoples you cite eat that meat because they is often little else available there. However, IMHO that is viable more because as omnivores we are wonderful at surviving on practically anything. I don't think these peoples have evolved so differently from the rest of humanity that they 'need' meat. Your case is based on 'animal protein' as if it alone has the amino acids necessary for humans.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not it. Like anything in nature, there are synergistic properties in meat that cannot be reduced to mere "amino acids" etc. I am not making that argument. You are.

Yeshe said:

Health, I agree, is a vague measure, but healing a wound is not. Since vegetarians heal, I see no evidence that meat is required.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on the kind of injury.

Yeshe said:

Again, digestive problems which respond to meat may also respond to soya etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not -- for example, for certain kinds of ulcerative conditions, pork works where other things do not.

I'm not for one minute, btw, seeking to challenge the effectiveness of your treatments, or your qualification to administer them and be curative, so apologies if that is how it appeared. I am myself a practitioner of holistic medicine, so try not to be reductionist.

Yeshe said:

I just don't accept that it is the only way. I have seen wounds healed with plant poultices for example,

Malcolm wrote:

External wounds, yes. However, pork fat mixed with a specific himalayan fern will all but erase scars and burns, etc.

Yeshe said:

as they used to deride the neem tree I mentioned - which instantly cured several of my students with bad stomachs in India. So, I'm not sceptical of your methods per se, just that meat is essential.

Malcolm wrote:

Meat is not essential for everyone nor essential all the time for those whom it is important. Not saying that. I am saying that meat has properties which are much more effective at treating certain conditions than plant based medicines. For example, certain kinds of meat are very beneficial for reproductive issues, etc. Can you find something else to use? Perhaps -- but the materia medica of meats is more or less the same in Ayurveda and Tibetan Medicine, with similar explanations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

meat eating is bad karmically all around....

i insisted that transporting the stuff and vegetables is killing insects and we all should realize we are acquiring karmic retribution...

my point is to make people aware of the horse Hockey and hypocrisy that is being pushed around....

Malcolm wrote:

Bluntly -- you do not understand karma as taught by the Buddha.

Read chapter four of the Abhidharmakosha.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

Well, that's proof that some of your patients believe that it has helped.

Malcolm wrote:

No, because I am diagnosing their problems, and following up, through classic pulse, urine analysis and so on.

Yeshe said:

There is no evidence that it is not a placebo effect, really. Yet there are many thousands who are healthy and heal well as evidence of the opposite. Meat as a useful component of diet is not at question here, just that it is needed as it has some exclusive healing property. Did you give them other treatments with amino acids, iron etc, or just use meat as that's what you were taught?

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, but this is a reductionist view. We do not analyze things in this way. We understand diet and medicines through five elements and three doshas. If you want iron and amino acids, go to an allopathic practitioner. In this case, I am referring to patients who have had problems for years, for example with digestion, that no western doctor can fix. I have my experience, that is all.

Yeshe said:

The sort of proof I am after is scientific evidence that people need meat to heal wounds, which was your assertion.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the person -- not everyone would. Many people do. In Tibetan Medicine and Ayurveda it is believed for example that if there is a problem with bone breaks, bone broth is very important. If one has kidney damage, eating kidneys of certain animals is very important, etc. Similar tissue will build similar tissue.

[/quote] Where are these people who must have meat instead of other food sources ?[/quote]

well, eskimos, mongolians, Tibetans, many Northern Europeans, etc. you might be surprised at the large numbers of people who have evolved with a high percentage of animal protein in their diet. I am quite certain these people really need some quantity (not large) of meat in their diets to be healthy.

"Health" however is not a scientifically targetable state. "Health" is a complicated state of mental and physical balance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Pero said:

edit: Oh wait, you meant the "founding teacher of Dzogchen" part?

Malcolm wrote:
Right.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:57 AM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:
rainbowtara said:
Polite reminder

'Meat eating'

Regards,
rt

Rael said:
i know...sorry....but there is always going to be a drift....people like me go nutso at times...and well....

i like to keep things honestpeople cracki'm hedging Namdrol won't be teaching people to eat meat in order to create future Buddhists anymore....

Malcolm wrote:
This is a teaching that is very common in Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:55 AM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:

Yeshe said:
Please address the assertions you made concerning meat as essential to healing and health. I have refuted it, as have others on this thread, yet you offer no research or evidential basis for the claims.

Malcolm wrote:
What do you accept as criteria for rebuttal?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:54 AM
Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Pero said:

He is a teacher. Whether you don't want to take him as your teacher is another matter.

Malcolm wrote:

People are very emotional about this issue. They have strong feelings. There are many different views. Not just one.

The most difficult issue about this question is the question of harm as opposed to negative karma.

According to Sakya Pandita -- In Hinayana, meat-eating is permitted. In Mahayana, it is prohibited. In Vajrayana it is permitted.

Rael's issue is with the Hinayana/Vajrayana permission around eating meat. I can see why he thinks Buddhism is hypocritical on this issue -- I don't agree with him, but I can see why he has his point of view. He just does not understand the niceties of karma in such an instance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

You also posit that people need meat to build tissue after operations, or for their health. Now, I can see how in Tibet in the last century, village folk medicine would maybe suggest that, but do you have proof which explains precisely how the body needs meat to create our human flesh, and that no other source of amino acids etc. will do. I am vegetarian and heal very quickly - a balanced human diet does not need meat for health. I know hundreds of vegetarians who are also healthy, which in research terms is a good sized sample. Anecdotally, I know some very well, such as one at my gym who is a retired world class cyclist and still marathon runner and is strictly vegan. You've also had research quoted to you on this thread. Where is your proof of the necessity of meat. please?

Yeshe

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Yeshe:

I generally eat a very healthy and balanced vegetarian diet. Mostly based on S. Indian cooking.

I have my experience as a practitioner of Tibetan medicine, one. I have treated many

people who are quite unhealthy, taking all kinds of supplements, eating balanced vegetarian diets who still have many health problems. They add a little meat to their diet -- health problem solved. I have seen this many times, not only once. You can criticize and imagine that such people are not really eating properly, but you would be wrong.

Such people are generally of European descent, but not only.

What sort of proof do you want? Nutritional scientists are all over the map on this one. You can find studies to prove you have to eat meat, studies that prove that you don't and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

if he is right he will clarify it and i will admit i'm wrong....

Malcolm wrote:

Clarify what?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

your everything thats wrong with Buddhism.....

yikes have i overstepped the boundaries of decent debate.....

Malcolm wrote:

Yup -- you have.

This is quite normal in internet conversations -- unable to reply reasonably, one resorts to ad hominem remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Nangwa said:

Shakyamuni is looked at as a "founding teacher of Dzogchen" because of his realization of his true condition and that he taught certain methods that can lead others to that same realization.

Malcolm wrote:

That should apply to all buddhas, but it doesn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

I don't accept the lame monastic excuse about accepting meat in the offering bowls - I believe that to be added by monks who wrote the sutras, for their own benefit, but the thread is thankfully not about their predilections.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you have to accept the converse, all passages written against meat-eating were written by monks according to their own predilections.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

tamdrin said:

Namdrol the difference is bugs and so forth are killed as a natural by product of producing vegetarian foods.

Malcolm wrote:

So you are saying that killing "pests" to raise food is less harmful to the "pests" that are harmed since you did not intend to harm them? I doubt they would agree.

tamdrin said:

Animals raised for slaughter are raised up specifically to be killed for human consumption.. They are bread this way, their whole life they are fed with the intention of making someone a tasty hamburger or slab of bacon.. Also as we know many of these animals are treated horrendously and tortured look at the videos about the chickens raised for Kentucky fried chicken for example.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. Terrible.

tamdrin said:

Although it may not be considered non virtuous to eat this meat according to Buddhism..

It would be considered virtuous to avoid creating a demand for it by not eating it and thus protecting animals from abuse, torture, and death..

Malcolm wrote:

So it is irrelevant in the case of vegetables and grain? We don't care what happens to insects, mice and so on?

Is it different when one kills gophers, mice and rats, aphids, etc. with pesticides and herbicides used on crops because we don't intend to eat these creatures?

If you reply, "Use organic crops", this does not help matters at all. Organic food production, especially at the scale we produce food in the US for the organic market requires the use of a whole range of organic pesticides and herbicides.

In order for these pests to die, isn't it so that someone must intend to kill them? And isn't it so that by ordering such vegetables and grain you are creating a demand for a food that involves abusing, torturing and killing animals such as gophers, rats, birds, and insects? Since we are not raising pests for food, when we kill them, this is just a "by-product" of a vegetarian diet?

tamdrin said:

Ps the notion that the animals you eat are going to be reborn as your students seems absurd.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with Guru Padmasambhava. It's his teaching, not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2011 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thanx. I suppose this is taken from rigpawiki.org where "Twelve teachers (Wyl. ston pa bcu gnyis) — the founding teachers of Dzogchen, also known as the 'twelve Dzogchen teachers'".

So here Shakyamuni is linked to the Buddha Shakyamuni (tibetan. Sangs-rgyas shakya thub pa) according to rigpawiki but maybe He did not teach Dzogchen, as Namdrol mentioned, but only some kind of initiated (manifested) it only to be later revealed by future masters, as in the case of HYT?

Namdrol said:

Shakyamuni is listed because Shakyamuni predicted that Dzogchen would be taught, he however never himself taught it in Jambudvīpa.

Mariusz said:

Is it means He taught himself Dzogchen outside Jambudvipa and from there it was moved by other masters to Jambudvipa and therefore He is also "the founding teacher of Dzogchen"?

Malcolm wrote:
no

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 11:58 PM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:
Yeshe said:
teeth are not for eating the product of suffering...

Malcolm wrote:
Then we are pretty much condemned to starve...sarva dukham

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 11:15 PM
Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen
Content:

Sönam said:

1. Khyeu Nangwa Dampa (ston pa khye'u snang ba dam pa)
2. Khyeu Ö Mitrukpa (ston pa khye'u 'od mi 'khrugs pa)
3. Jikpa Kyob (ston pa 'jigs pa skyob)
4. Shyönnu Rolpa Nampar Tsewa (ston pa gzhon nu rol pa rnam par brtse ba)
5. Dorje Chang (ston pa rdo rje 'chang)
6. Shyönnu Pawo (ston pa gzhon nu dpa' bo)
7. Drangsong Tröpé Gyalpo (ston pa drang srong khros pa'i rgyal po)
8. Ser Ö Dampa (ston pa gser 'od dam pa)
9. Tsewé Rolpé Lodrö (ston pa brtse bas rol pa'i blo gros)
10. Ösung Drepo (ston pa 'od srung bgres po)
11. Ngöndzok Gyalpo (ston pa mngon rdzogs rgyal po)
12. Shakyamuni (ston pa shAkya thub pa)

Mariusz said:

Thanx. I suppose this is taken from rigpawiki.org where "Twelve teachers (Wyl. ston pa bcu gnyis) — the founding teachers of Dzogchen, also known as the 'twelve Dzogchen teachers'".

So here Shakyamuni is linked to the Buddha Shakyamuni (tibetan. Sangs-rgyas shakya thub pa) according to rigpawiki but maybe He did not teach Dzogchen, as Namdrol mentioned, but only some kind of initiated (manifested) it only to be later revealed by

future masters, as in the case of HYT?

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamuni is listed because Shakyamuni predicted that Dzogchen would be taught, he however never himself taught it in Jambudvīpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

The source for the information that Avatamsaka sutra is somewhere in Kangyur, classified as a yoga tantra text, comes from some book about the 14th Karmapa Jamgon Kongtrul. Jamgon Kongtrul namely quotes Avatamsaka sutra in his works, certainly in Myriad Worlds for example, and this author explains that the text that Jamgon Kongtrul has read is found in yoga tantra category (can't remember its actual name). (And I'm sorry again for the inaccuracy about this source!) (I was astonished that it is not common knowledge!)

Malcolm wrote:

The Yoga tantras make use of the Buddhist cosmology first laid out in Avatamsaka, but Avatamsaka is not a Yoga tantra. He cites Flower Ornament three times, but never as a yoga tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Unknown said:

Also, what karma are you creating by consuming meat?

Malcolm wrote:

Me? Zero.

Unknown said:

Every action has an effect, so what do you suppose the karmic effect of consuming the bodies of others unnecessarily is going to create?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know about you, but when I eat meat, the sentient being associated with those remains has long since exited the bardo. When I eat meat, I am not torturing anyone. There is no magical trace on the corpse of that animal. There is no magic connection.

When I eat meat, I understand that the animal of course did not want to die. I feel compassion for that animal.

Nevertheless, that animal would be dead no matter whether I eat its remains or not. This is a fact.

At least when I eat the remains of an animal, I have a direct representation of a suffering sentient being to work with -- and to the bargain, its death is not completely wasted. At least its remains, its physical elements, are reinforcing the life and practice of a Dharma practitioner.

When I eat meat, I have a mind, the animal has a mind -- and through my intention in considering that animal's plight in samsara, I make a connection with that animal through the mind. That connection is made stronger because now I have a direct representation of that animal. Thinking of that animal, I can recite a healing mantra. By thinking of that animal, I make a connection. And that animal, according to the teachings, will eventually be reborn as my student. By eating meat, I am using meat as a means for increasing compassion.

And since, at this point the animal's mind is no longer connected to that piece of meat in front of me, the sentient being that used to own that flesh is not harmed at all when I consume that left over meat from its corpse. Whatever harm it experienced had already happened. It is somewhere else in the three realms, it is not a ghost inhabiting the dead flesh in front of me. There is no shamanistic trace of the animal left on that dead corpse once the mind has parted the body. At that point, it is just an inanimate collection of four elements.

When I eat plant based food, it is the same. I know for a fact that many beings were harmed in the process of bring that food to my plate. So I also consider that when I am eating an apple, for example. Or an orange. Etc. So I bring awareness to that act of eating, recite a healing mantra, make a connection with all the beings harmed and destroyed by harvesting of that plant-based food.

Living in samsara necessarily involves harming other living beings. But harming other living beings does not necessarily involve negative karma. Buddha understood this distinction; Mahavira and Devadatta did not.

For example, many kinds of beings make homes in trees, in plants, and so on. When we destroy their homes and bodies to harvest plant food, or build a house, or mow our lawn, etc., we are contributing to their suffering -- but we don't care. Somehow, this escapes the attention of some strict Buddhist vegetarians. Somehow, they don't seem to care about the poisons used in agriculture that poison not only insects, but birds, small animals, and so on.

The illogic of your point of view is that when someone eats meat they are necessarily 1) responsible for the karmic acts of another (already rejected) 2) contributing to the suffering of the animal (already rejected). Neither of these arguments is valid.

It is certain that when you slaughter meat, or order it from a butcher directly, you are contributing to that suffering -- but that is all. It is also a certainty that when you harvest plants you will kill some creature. There is no doubt. And you will also be robbing many others of their homes. Not only that, you will be stealing the food of many other creatures. Oh, for sure you can claim -- "This is my food, I planted it, the birds, deer and insects are stealing it from me" -- but they do not see it that way.

So we can imagine a perfect samsara where no one is suffering -- but of course such a samsara is just a fantasy.

Unknown said:

I don't believe that consuming the bodies of others is conducive to attaining enlightenment; the Lankavatara Sutra agrees, saying that the consuming of meat harms the development of compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

Right and the Hevajra tantra says that those with compassion eat meat. So? You can follow provisional sutras like the Lanka-avatara, I will follow tantra. And yes, I am aware of what Kalacakra says on the subject. I have also read Shabkar.

Unknown said:

If you think about it, it makes perfect sense. If we want even the tiniest thing from others, much less disregarding their pain so that we can consume their bodies, a supremely compassionate mind will not be forthcoming.

Malcolm wrote:

Who's disregarding pain and suffering? When I eat meat [the little meat that I do eat], it is a conscious choice, and serves as a cause for compassion, as I have explained.

In reality, my body is made of four elements, a plant is made of four elements, the bodies of sentient beings are made of four elements. There is no difference in this respect. We use different combinations of the four elements for different purposes, depending on our constitution and our health.

You may claim that no one needs to eat meat to maintain a healthy body -- but then you have to explain why Medicine Buddha explains the use of so many different kinds of meat in our diet as well as in medicine.

So as I have said, the main point is to be aware of what you are doing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

As for myself, due to a surgery I had slow healing injuries that required that I eat meat.

gregkavarnos said:

Get well soon! Tayatha om bekhandze bekhandze maha bekhandze raja samudgate
soha! medicine-buddha.jpg

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks, that surgery was a couple of years ago. But it took a long time to heal --
somehow, since I did not eat any meat for the first year afterwards, it is still not perfect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

...Due to this the thread snapped and the robber fell back into the Hell realms.:

Malcolm wrote:

And all of this was directly connected with the robber's intention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

As an aside: I have noticed Namdrol that you have changed your opinion on
vegetarianism since your e-sangha days. Have you stopped being a vegetarian/vegan?

Malcolm wrote:

Fair question.

I have said repeatedly in this thread that eating meat is not good. That in general it is
negative.

What I have rejected is that meat eating has a moral i.e. karmic consequence even
though one is not involved in killing animals and do not ask people to do so on one's
behalf.

I also made this clarification on e-sangha.

As for myself, due to a surgery I had slow healing injuries that required that I eat meat.

However, I maintain a vegetarian kitchen, and never cook meat at home.

I do eat meat in restaurants provided that the meat is not raised inhumanely.

So, while I do not claim to be a vegetarian -- my diet is 95 percent plant based. I eat perhaps at most a pound of flesh a month on average.

When I do eat meat, I employ a method to make a connection with the creature in question, so I do not remain indifferent or unaware.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: I need a job

Content:

tamdrin said:

Hi,

I recently graduated from University with a degree in Religion and Philosophy. Not much I can do with that I know, but I did it because it was my area of interest. Now I am faced with the "real world" and the necessity of making a living for myself. I am having trouble finding work and want to find the best job I can or make one up (gotta be creative sometimes) without settling for something totally crappy. Do you have any ideas what is a good way to make a living for a Buddhist?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Wait tables, serve meat and alcohol?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

if an entire communal village living next to general store does not eat meat.....less meat will be delivered to that general store.....If they are not vegetarian meat will be upped...

Malcolm wrote:

That might have been true even 50 years ago, but with the modern grocery store system....

Not really -- more meat and vegetables both are thrown away by supermarkets every day than are actually purchased. The amount of waste in the Western food supply chain is astonishing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

your trying to refine the laws of Karma to suit the western modern world Namdrol

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, just explaining Karma the way Buddha did in the 5th century BCE.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

Frankly, there are other issues of more pressing importance.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Not if you are a cow, pig, fish, lamb or any other animal consumed by human beings. It's uncompassionate not to be concerned about their lives.

Malcolm wrote:

"Eating meat" does not mean one is not concerned.

We do not eat the minds of sentient beings -- we eat their bodies which have been separated from their minds. What suffers is the mind, not the body. It is quite possible to eat meat and be a supremely compassionate person, for example, HH Dalai Lama, etc.

Somehow, we think it is ok to be indifferent if one animal kills and eats another for food - - but somehow it is worse when humans kill and eat animals. We don't spend much time worrying about spiders feeding on flies, etc. We think it is "natural", part of samsara, part of their suffering. Well, the suffering of animals is to eat one another. In this respect, human beings eat animals, and always have. Of course there are some exceptions, but virtually everywhere we go in the world, we find human beings are consuming animals. This is part of Samsara. Are we indifferent to suffering? No. Can we fix that suffering? No. No one can stop the suffering of another being. It is impossible. Not even Buddha can stop the suffering of the six realms. If he could have, he would have.

So we are left with samsara. It is suffering. We are trying end that suffering. If one thinks that refraining from eating meat is stopping some animal's suffering in a real sense, one is deluded. By the time its remains come to your plate, it is already reborn, lunch for something else. This is not indifference, this is reality.

There is only one way to stop suffering. Meet Dharma, reflect on Dharma, realize Dharma. That's it.

So, whether we eat meat or not, we try to be compassionate and move on to more important issues.

Some Buddhists turn vegetarianism into kind of a political party, spending lots of time trying to condition others with their views: "We are the fantastic vegetarians, true followers of Buddha". All this amounts to is "lta ba phyogs 'dzin", grasping onto biased views.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2011 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

you can't hide and say you do not know if you are killing....

Malcolm wrote:

You need to distinguish between "taking a life" which is an act that has a karmic result from "killing", which is not necessarily a karmic act in the Buddhist sense of term. If people going to slaughter animals whether I eat them or not (all evidence suggests they will), than there is very little reason to assume my eating meat is "creating" demand.

"Taking a life" i.e. killing in this sense is an intentional act. You have a being, you have motivation (you want to kill this being), you have the act itself, and then you are happy you did it. This is a perfect act of killing i.e. taking a life. This is explained very well by the Buddha.

Eating meat does not satisfy any of these criteria of necessity. Hence, you can eat meat without it necessarily being an act that produces some kind of huge negative karmic burden.

Frankly, there are other issues of more pressing importance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

tamdrin said:

Sorry, But that is nonsense... Don't buy and don't consume the meat and you are not supporting their meat sales..

Malcolm wrote:

Supply creates demand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Astus said:

Aemilius,

Could you brush up your sources? I mean, when you refer to a text as a source you should have access to it and be able to give an exact citation. First you say Wayman said the Avatamsaka Sutra is among the tantras, now that Conze was unaware of the large number of meditation texts. Both are unlikely statements.

"As a more or less public system of thought, the Tantra gathered momentum after 500 or 600 A.D. Its beginnings do, however, go back to the dawn of human history, when an agricultural society was pervaded by magic and witchcraft, human sacrifice and the cult of the mother goddess, fertility rites and chthonic deities. The Tantra is not really a new creation, but the result of an absorption of primitive beliefs by the literary tradition, and their blending with Buddhist philosophy."

(Edward Conze: Buddhism - Its Essence and Development, p. 176-177)

Later he lists three practices specific to Tantra:

1. the recitation of spells
2. the performance of ritual gestures and dances
3. the identification with deities by means of a special kind of meditation

Malcolm wrote:

This characterization of tantra by Conze is naive and silly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

green peace co-founder patrick moore lamented that the group had been co-opted by hardcore communists, hell bent on shutting down western industry and resources.

gregkavarnos said:

Damn green-commies (red and green together, that would make a nasty shade of pooh brown right?), always f*****g up the program of merciless profit generation at the expense of global well-being!

Should be shot! Or sent to Gulags!

Malcolm wrote:

The proper term is "watermelons" -- green on the outside, red on the inside.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Conze remarks that there is very little actual meditation practice instructions, or none at all, in the Mahayana Sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

Conze must not have read many Mahayana sutras, then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Is in these Nyingma sources mentioned if Śakyamuni also manifested there, for example as Vajrakilaya, as was in the case of Kalachakra and Vajrabhairava?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no involvement with Shakyamuni in any Mahayoga Tantra in Nyingma. It is not

necessary. Teaching of tantras is mainly a Sambhogakāya teaching. Nirmanakāyas do not possess the five certainties.

In my personal opinion, these "proofs" that Shakyamuni Buddha was directly related to disseminating Anuttarayoga tantra are baseless.

As I said, we have example where according to tradition, the Buddha manifested the mandalas of Kalacakra and Guhyasamaja. But manifesting a mandala and teaching are two different things altogether. Even here, while Indrabhuti spread the Guhyasamaja in his kingdom eventually the lineage died out. It was later revived by a Dakini who received it from Vajrapani, and bestowed both the Tattvasamgraha and the Guhyasamaja to King Visukalpa, who then spread it very widely in South India. In reality the author of the present recension of the Guhyasamaja Tantra is Indrabhuti. The author of the present recension of the Hevajra is Mahasiddha Virupa, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Water offering mantra translation?

Content:

conebeckham said:

...pronounced, by most Tibetans, "Sapariwara" as the V becomes a "W" (and is usually written with a བ (ba)

dakini_boi said:

Thank you. On the topic of transliteration, why is the Sanskrit व (va/wa) often transliterated into Tibetan as བ when the Tibetan script has བ (va/wa) specifically for the purpose? ex. Skt. Vajra वज्र becomes Tib. བཞེད Bajra - not བཞེད Vajra. This is not a question of pronunciation, but of transliteration - other sounds that are pronounced differently in Tibetan are still transliterated according to the Sanskrit. Is this just an error made in early translations that was repeated until it became convention? Anyone know?

While I'm at it, in the water offering mantra above, where is the stress placed in "saparana"? is it "saPARana"?

Thanks for continued help

Malcolm wrote:

བ is can be pronounced either as ba or as wa in Tibetan. In Amdo dialect which is very ancient all བ instances are pronounced wa.

Also in Nepal where most Tibetan translators learned to pronounce mantras, Sanskrit "va" is pronounced "ba". It is the same in Kashmir. Sakya Pandita notes this regional variation in his "how to pronounce mantras" guidebook.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

Thank you Nevertheless Samantabhadra is not included in the lineage of Guhyasamaja as I checked the middle lenght sadhana translated by Alexander Berzin but Vajradhara.

Malcolm wrote:

Irrelevant -- Guhyasamaja tantra mentions dharmakāya Samantabhadra by name. Vajradhara is related to transmission, Samantabhadra to essence.

Mariusz said:

But I don't know details how Ratna Lingpa proof them. Could you write more how They managed it?

Malcolm wrote:

Some people, like Go Khugpa Lhatse, etc., negated Guhyagarbha -- later a Sanskrit copy of Guhyagarbha was discovered at Samye. Same with Vajrakilaya -- some gsar ma scholars negated Vajrakilaya until a yogi presented Sakya Pandita with a text written in Padmasambhava's own handwriting in Sanskrit, the Kilaya Fragment Tantra, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 12:03 PM

Title: Re: Water offering mantra translation?

Content:

dakini_boi said:

Thank you!

So should it be SAPARIWARA or APARIWARA?

Malcolm wrote:

Saparivara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 12:02 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

CO2 is only one of the greenhouse gases -- there are many others more pernicious.

Heruka said:
can you site sources for this.

thanks

Malcolm wrote:
Sulfur hexafluoride, for example.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sulfur_hexafluoride#Greenhouse_gas "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 10:03 AM
Title: Re: Water offering mantra translation?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
SAPARIWARA -- retinue

ARGHAM -- drinking water.

PRATITSA -- receive

PUDZA -- offering

MEGHA -- cloud

SAMUDRA -- ocean

SAPARANA --spreads

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 9:49 AM
Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.
Content:

Heruka said:
green peace co-founder patrick moore lamented that the group had been co-opted by
hardcore communists, hell bent on shutting down western industry and resources.

also still waiting for clear empirical data to show anthropogenic global warming is a real
issue. the earth in past times has had much greater c02 levels than at present, and life
in those times exploded in variation scope and size since c02 consumed by plant life
and release oxygen. the carbon cycle on earth can handle massive c02 out gassing from
volcanoes, on the scale many times that of human activity.

carbon monoxide however is a different animal.

Malcolm wrote:

CO2 is only one of the greenhouse gases -- there are many others more pernicious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

muni said:

Pointing "out"? miss the language feeling.

Make Dzogchen??

Maybe transmission is suiting label.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I don't understand how you write.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Caz said:

What would a deep Green awakening entail ?

gregkavarnos said:

This does it for me, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep_ecology "

onclick="window.open(this.href);return false; , especially the social ecology of Murray Bookchin.

Malcolm wrote:

Check out David Orton's Left Bio Centrism Primer:

Left Biocentrism Primer

March 15, 1998

The following Primer is a result of a protracted collective discussion among a number of those who support left biocentrism and deep ecology.

- Left biocentrism is a left focus or theoretical tendency within the deep ecology movement, which is subversive of the existing industrial society. It accepts and

promotes the eight-point Deep Ecology Platform drawn up by Arne Naess and George Sessions. Left biocentrism holds up as an ideal, identification, solidarity, and compassion with all life. "Left" as used in left biocentrism, means anti- industrial and anti-capitalist, but not necessarily socialist. The expressions 'left biocentrism' or 'left ecocentrism' are used interchangeably.

- Left biocentrism accepts the view that the Earth belongs to no one. While raising a number of criticisms, left biocentrism is meant to strengthen, not undermine, the deep ecology movement which identifies with all life.

- Left biocentrism says that individuals must take responsibility for their actions and be socially accountable. Part of being individually responsible is to practice voluntary simplicity, so as to minimize one's own impact upon the Earth.

- Left biocentrists are concerned with social justice and class issues, but within a context of ecology. To move to a deep ecology world, the human species must be mobilized, and a concern for social justice is a necessary part of this mobilization. Left biocentrism is for the redistribution of wealth, nationally and internationally.

- Left biocentrism opposes economic growth and consumerism. Human societies must live within ecological limits so that all other species may continue to flourish. We believe that bioregionalism, not globalism, is necessary for sustainability. The perspective of the late German Green philosopher Rudolf Bahro is accepted that, for world-wide sustainability, industrialized countries need to reduce their impact upon the Earth to about one tenth of what it is at the present time. It is also incumbent upon non-industrialized nations to become sustainable and it is necessary for industrialized nations to help on this path.

- Left biocentrism holds that individual and collective spiritual transformation is important to bring about major social change, and to break with industrial society. We need inward transformation, so that the interests of all species override the short-term self-interest of the individual, the family, the community, and the nation.

- Left biocentrism believes that deep ecology must be applied to actual environmental issues and struggles, no matter how socially sensitive, e.g. population reduction, aboriginal issues, workers' struggles, etc.

- Social ecology, eco-feminism and eco-marxism, while raising important questions, are all human-centered and consider human-to-human relations within society to be more important and, in the final analysis, determine society's relationship to the natural world. Left biocentrism believes that an egalitarian, non-sexist, non-discriminating society, a highly desirable goal, can still be exploitive towards the Earth.

- Left biocentrists are "movement greens" in basic orientation. They are critical of existing Green political parties, which have come to an accommodation with industrial society and have no accountability to the deep ecology movement.

- To be politically relevant, deep ecology needs to incorporate the perspective advanced by left biocentrism.

David Orton
Coordinator, Green Web
R.R. #3 Salt Springs, Nova Scotia, Canada B0K 1P0
mailto:greenweb@fox.nstn.ca

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 3:22 AM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
These kinds of things we have to understand in an interpretive way.

Definitive, according to Akshayamatiniirdesha means no mention of persons, beings, self, other, etc. Provisional means discourses concerning self, persons, beings, living creatures, etc.

Did not think you are imposing, just adding that as it is important component to these discussions.

We Buddhists don't kill -- this is axiomatic. It is the first rule. Second, we try to limit harm (ahimsa).

There is never a time when meat, in the medicine tantras, is absolutely endorsed or prohibited. It is regarded as a normal part of human diet. Sometimes eaten, sometimes not.

It is clear to me that eating meat is not "good" for all the reasons many have given. In our culture, eating industrial meat is very bad, actually in terms of grain, water, fuel, cruelty, etc.

In more ancient cultures, people were closer to the source. If a monastery wanted meat, they had to order it directly from the nomads that butchered the meat and so on. So there is a little bit of difference. etc.

Namdrol said:
First of all, this objection has been addressed by Bhavaviveka.

You have to understand -- we are under no obligation to regard all sutras as definitive except those sutras defined according to the criteria of Akshayanirmatinirdesha sutra. So there is a limit to how much citations can serve you.

Adamantine said:

Not serving me, these are citations Chatral Rinpoche uses. Apparently he is not that concerned with the criteria of the Akshayanirmatinirdesha sutra? What are these criteria?

Medicine Buddha taught the four tantras of medicine, also he included meat as part of diet, not just medicines.

I am assuming, as with ayurveda, that prescriptions of meat in the diet are for those with particular constitutions, not for everyone-- therefore it still functions as a type of medicine. Or do the tantras prescribe dietary meat across the board? And btw, what is the history of the Medicine Buddha tantras? Why would we accept these over the sutras cited above?

When you go a restaurant. You have a menu -- on it are several items beef, lamb, fish, poultry, and some vegetarian items. Merely going to the restaurant that serves meat means that you are participating in the negative karma of eating meat. Why? Because they are preparing meat whether you eat it or not.

When you go a market that sells meat -- whether you buy their meat or not you are supporting them, thus you are supporting their meat sales. And on and on it goes. I totally agree, I used this same argument in a similar way in another thread because I also believe fanatics should walk their talk in this regard. And while I do accept there are certain conditions where meat eating is acceptable and should be used as medicine, or in particular cases for diet, and for ganapuja-- I also think there is certainly a web of interconnection in the marketplace and we can't ignore that even a drop in the water creates ripples that may become quite vast. Because of this, whenever possible I try to eat at vegetarian restaurants and shop at vegetarian marketplaces. I realize this may be hard to do in certain locations, however it is not difficult where I live. Ultimately, it'd be great if some Buddhist-ethic farms developed here where bugs were not intentionally killed and dairy animals were treated with love like pets and never killed. I did meet a couple old ladies in an LA farmers market once who had a goat-dairy business, they make nice cheeses and all the goats are treated this way-- they just live till old age and die of natural causes.. none are ever sold for slaughter..

In the end, you have to do what you feel is right.

Sure.

But also you have to be aware enough that you are not imposing your idea on others. Conditioning others through your own moral sense never works.

I believe having discussions like this to clarify Buddhist views is only a positive thing. I didn't feel I was trying to impose my own view on others, however, there are Tibetan lineage masters who certainly feel strongly about this issue such as HH the Karmapa and Chatral Rinpoche, HH the Dalai Lama, Paltrul Rinpoche, Shabkar, etc. not to mention the lesser known ones. However, since there are other great teachers who hold a different view I try not to impose or judge anyone. Because there is a lack of consensus among the masters themselves we are left to our own reasoning, by sharing the views of some of these teachers, or my own thoughts with others it is not an attempt to impose my view! Debate is always meant to clarify, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Dexing said:

Where is it taught the use of animal products, and likewise meat-eating, creates a karmic connection with the animals in intentionally using their bodies to fulfill your "needs"? This may not be the karma of killing, but it creates a debt that must be repaid to them, which may result in rebirth as a service animal— a cow or such that is worked and exploited for milk and eventually meat, clothing, etc.— to rectify the outstanding balance due them.

Malcolm wrote:

By the time the remains of an animal wind up on your plate, their consciousness is long gone, reborn. This is one of the reasons why Bhavaviveka rejects the idea that meat eating is necessarily bad karma. The meat on your plate, from his perspective, is inert.

It is hard to prove this karmic debt exists, through it is a popular idea.

You probably owe the bugs on your car grill a debt, though.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

gregkavarnos said:

Dear namdrol,

Where can we find this sutra: Akshayanirmatinirdesha sutra? A web search turns up absolutely nothing. Is it available in English? If not can you give a (brief) outline of the qualities it mentions?

Thank you!

Malcolm wrote:

My bad:

Akshayamatinirdesha sutra...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

Also, No meat can be regarded as pure if it was premeditated, asked for or desired; therefore refrain from eating meat --

How many people eating meat can with full honesty say while ordering meat at a restaurant or buying it at the market they are not asking for it or desiring it? Obviously a monk begging door to door that get's some meat gruel dropped in their bowl is free from these faults, but how is that possible for people handling money in the market economy?

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, this objection has been addressed by Bhavaviveka.

You have to understand -- we are under no obligation to regard all sutras as definitive except those sutras defined according to the criteria of Akshayanirmatinirdesha sutra. So there is a limit to how much citations can serve you.

Medicine Buddha taught the four tantras of medicine, also he included meat as part of diet, not just medicines.

When you go a restaurant. You have a menu -- on it are several items beef, lamb, fish, poultry, and some vegetarian items. Merely going to the restaurant that serves meat means that you are participating in the negative karma of eating meat. Why? Because they are preparing meat whether you eat it or not.

When you go a market that sells meat -- whether you buy their meat or not you are supporting them, thus you are supporting their meat sales. And on and on it goes.

In the end, you have to do what you feel is right. But also you have to be aware enough that you are not imposing your idea on others. Conditioning others through your own moral sense never works.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

This isn't a statement of karma? Those sentient beings who feed on one another will be reborn as carnivorous animals.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is a statement about karma. Just not about the karma of killing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:
muni said:
Namdrol: "The Buddha did not teach Dzogchen".

Merely " 'teaching' Dzogchen ", of course, if so, why should there be any need to study sutras, tantras, shastras... Should be any need to say: it is not this, it is not that...

Not sure he was teaching "Buddhism".

Namdrol said:
Not really sure I understand the point of your comment.

muni said:
Thanks for patience. Only pointings regarding "real nature" (Dzogchen). If he said I never spoke, is this pointing, like terma.

Malcolm wrote:
"Pointing out" does not make something "Dzogchen", for example, the pointing out instructions in Kagyu Mahamudra is not Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:40 AM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:
Namdrol said:

Eating meat does not equal the act of killing. It is really quite simple and there is nothing to argue about. Killing is the taking of a life intentionally. Eating meat is just like eating any other kind of food, when one gets right down to the basics. Eating meat does not possess the karma of killing. This is just a fact, from a Buddhist point of view, take it or leave it.

Adamantine said:
Namdrol, I appreciate you sharing your knowledge, you are perhaps the most widely read one among us here. But how do you reconcile the above statement with the excerpts of sutras quoting Buddha that Kyabje Chatral Rinpoche refers us to?

Malcolm wrote:
All of these sutra passages state that eating meat is objectionable. Not one of them states that eating meat bears the karma of killing.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

KeithBC said:

I agree with Namdrol that the karma of wearing leather shoes, for example, is not the karma of killing. Knowing that they are made from killed animals and not caring is the karma of not caring. Avoiding knowledge of where they come from is the karma of willful ignorance. Wearing them just because you like them is the karma of craving. None of them is the karma of killing, but none of them is wholesome either.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said Keith, the point is to be aware. To understand your world. Then, if you are aware, you can understand why Buddha permitted monks in cold places from far away to wear leather. Also plastic is not better -- proof of that is BP and a chemicals industry poisoning the waterways and air.

Buddha's path is not ideological. It is about awareness. To not be indifferent. Often we must do things that are not ideal -- so, we do not remain indifferent, we do not remain ignorant, and we do not just give into craving. We bring awareness to our state.

Using electricity brings one problem; burning wood brings another. Driving a car brings one problem, riding a bike, another. Everything we do harms something else. Impossible to live completely without harming others. This is why Ahimsa from a Buddhist point of view does not involve living in a desert starving oneself to death -- it involves being aware.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

My point about the untouchables....obviously they considered the act of fishing and slaughtering and such karmically bad and somehow they figured out an angle to not get the karma....Your intent stuff is similar to their attitudes...it's hypocrisy at it's worse... How can you say wiping the bugs of your windscreen is unconscious....and then talk of the bugs you missed...

Malcolm wrote:

Either you accept the Buddha's teaching about karma or you do not. You either think it is hypocritical or you do not. It's up to you.

Not everything that we do is karma, since not everything we do is linked with a specific intention. Karma is only linked with specific intentions. If I harm a bug because I am walking -- this is not karma. It is impossible to walk without harming something, let

alone drive.

If you like the jain theory, then be a jain. Definitely, Jains criticized the Buddha because they decided his theory of karma was too loose.

Eating meat does not equal the act of killing. It is really quite simple and there is nothing to argue about. Killing is the taking of a life intentionally. Eating meat is just like eating any other kind of food, when one gets right down to the basics. Eating meat does not possess the karma of killing. This is just a fact, from a Buddhist point of view, take it or leave it.

Of course, we can criticize eating meat for all kinds of reasons -- it creates demand, causing others to kill and so on and so forth. But Buddha was clear -- we do not share karma. Karma is personal, and individual. If I kill an animal and sell its meat to you, I alone am responsible for that act of killing -- and not you.

ཐོག་མཁོ་

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2011 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

it's like the Japanese and the untouchables then....you let them do the dirty work and we are cool and pristine....

Malcolm wrote:

That depends -- if you treat butchers as inferior because they make a living by slaughtering animals, then you have a problem with attachment and aversion. That has its own karma.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

Sorry, but I have quite certainly read that Avatamsaka sutra is there, with some name or another, in the class of yoga tantras if I right remember, unfortunately Alex Wayman is deceased, he would ceratainly know this topic.

Sorry, but I have analyzed in detail the contents of the bka' 'rgyur personally, so I will have suggest that my direct experience of reading many texts in this collection sutras and tantras supersedes your second hand report.

You can of course choose to read through it yourself to prove me wrong:

http://www.tbrc.org/#library_work-O3JW118743JW21498 "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

There are six bka' 'rgyurs at the end of this link. Look there.

The only text, as I have said, in the rgyud 'bum from Avatamska is the dharani:

[http://www.tbrc.org/link/?RID=O1GS12980%7CO1GS1298001JW14118\\$W22084#library_work_Object-O1GS12980%257CO1GS1298001JW14118\\$W22084](http://www.tbrc.org/link/?RID=O1GS12980%7CO1GS1298001JW14118$W22084#library_work_Object-O1GS12980%257CO1GS1298001JW14118$W22084) "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

I don't claim to say that there is no difference between them. But when you read and hear various definitions of initiation, -and they are many and various-, it is not so obvious what is and what is not Tantra?

There are four types of initiations in Vajrayana. There are no types of initiations at all in Sutra, apart from the name "abhisheka" found in the sources referenced above, and I am sure, others Mahayana sutras that talk about the transition from tenth bhumi to buddhahood.

The four types of initiations found as described in Indo -- Tibetan sources are:

a rig gtad i.e. the simple entrustment of a vidyāmantra -- this system belongs primarily to kriya tantra.

rje gngang: this is permission right, which is a blessing of body, speech and mind. This is comes from Caryā tantra, and can be applied to most deities.

There is abhisheka [dbang skur] -- this comes from Kriya tantra, is more developed in Yoga tantra.

byin rlabs -- this is a type of blessing ritual specific to Anuttarayoga tantra -- it is an abbreviated form of dbang skur, abhisheka where the outer vase empowerment is significantly shortened and the main emphasis is on the three higher abhishekas.

We might add to this, the so called rig pa' rtsal dbang of Dzogchen Atiyoga.

The names may be different in Shingon and Tendai, but the basic principles will be the same up to Yoga tantra.

Other than these aforementioned types of initiations, there are no other types of initiations in Vajrayana.

What is your opinion, is Vairocana Abhisambodhi a Sutra when it is called by that name ?

Also some Dzogchen tantras are given the name "sutra". What counts is content and method.

When we say "Sutra" and "Tantra" we are making a distinction between methods. This does not mean that every tantric text must be called a "tantra" to be in fact a tantric text.

This is mostly confusing when we are talking about early transitional texts in the evolution of the Buddhist tantras -- for example, the Mahāvairocana abhisambodhi tantra is called a sutra in earlier, Japanese recensions.

Tantra is not dependent on the word tantra, or the word rgyud!

Malcolm wrote:

Primarily what distinguishes a tantra from a sutra is method.

Anyway, if you are still confused about this I suggest you try to read Jamgon Kongtrul's Systems of Buddhist Tantra where he makes it quite clear what the difference between sutra and tantra is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Astus said:

But what is the definitive attribute of tantra that makes it separate from sutra? Like, for instance, according to Kukai it is that exoteric teachings were taught by rupakaya buddha and they're all upaya, while the esoteric teachings are from the dharmakaya buddha and they convey the truth as it is. Although it's possible to argue with that but I guess that's a start.

Malcolm wrote:

Tripitikamala's famous statement is:

"Although the goal is the same, since it is unconfused,
with many methods, not difficult,
and mastered by those of sharp faculties,
Mantrayāna is superior."

In terms of methods, the Vajrapanjara states:

"Created by passion, the worldly
shall be liberated by the same passion."

Etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

But the same is in HYT where is for example "only" Vajradhara as the Dharmakaya.

Namdrol said:

This actually not true -- the Guhyasamaja tantra also refers to the dharmakāya as Samantabhadra, as does the yogatantra Sarvatathagatatattva-saṃgraha.

Mariusz said:

But we can not say "The Buddha did not teach HYT" because Samantabhadra did it. The same is in case of Dzogchen. Can we?

Malcolm wrote:

When I said "The Buddha" I was referring to The Historical Buddha, Shakyamuni.

Even so, Shakyamuni did not actually teach the anuttarayoga tantras. He gave the empowerment of Guhyasamaja to Indrabhuti. Indrabhuti achieved awakening. Indrabhuti wrote down the Guhyasamaja after that point. Kalacakra is similar. Buddha manifested Kalacakra mandala in the Dhanyakataka stupa. Others wrote the tantra down at a later time. Chakrasamvara has never been connected with Shakyamuni indirectly or directly. Of course some scholars, mainly Gelugpas, in the past have gone to much trouble to prove otherwise.

If you follow Nyingmapa tradition, you understand that King Jah received some text somehow, practiced Vajrasattva, had a vision and received the mahayoga tantras in that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Mariusz said:

But the same is in HYT where is for example "only" Vajradhara as the Dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

This actually not true -- the Guhyasamaja tantra also refers to the dharmakāya as Samantabhadra, as does the yogatantra Sarvatathagatatattva-saṃgraha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

muni said:

Namdrol: "The Buddha did not teach Dzogchen".

Merely " 'teaching' Dzogchen ", of course, if so, why should there be any need to study sutras, tantras, shastras... Should be any need to say: it is not this, it is not that...

Not sure he was teaching "Buddhism".

Malcolm wrote:

Not really sure I understand the point of your comment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Aemilius said:

It depends on how you see it; "sutra" is merely a word, "tantra" is merely a word. In Tibet they have a translation of the Avatamsaka Sutra in Kangyur, but they felt it belongs to the category of Tantra, and so it is found in the Tantra section of the Kangyur, not in the Sutra Section. Similarly in Japan the Vairocana Abhisambodhi Tantra is classified as a Sutra. And so on,... The Sutra Of Golden Light has also been classified a Tantra by some tibetan scholars, (this is told in a work translated by Alex Wayman).

Obviously there is oral transmission in all of the Mahayana schools, it is not something peculiar to tantras only.

Avatamsaka sutra speaks of abhiseka or initiation in the career of a bódhisattva, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

The Avatamsaka sutra is not found in the rgyud sde of the Kangyur, I can assure you since I have access to several versions. There is a two volume collection at the end of the rgyud sde where all dharanis from both sutra and tantra are collected. The dharanis in the Avatamska are also found there.

The abhisheka mentioned in the Dasabhumisutra and the Lanka-avatara is only bestowed upon tenth stage bodhisattvas. It is not a method that is taught for ordinary people.

These kinds of misconceptions have been put to bed by Indian tantric scholars 1200 years ago. Tripitakamala is one person you should read to understand the difference between sutra and tantras, as well as many others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Yeshe said:

I know Jains well, and how they live according to 'ahimsa', and also the difference between creating a demand for meat which is a direct cause of death, and accidentally killing creatures which MAY happen to get in the way when we drive a car. The Jains I know best live in the desert where any food is scarce, so I also reject the argument that some people 'have to' eat meat. I also reject the argument that an omnivore must have meat for good health.

Malcolm wrote:

Rejecting that argument that meat is medicine is to reject parts of the Vinaya (Bhaisajyavastu), where meat is recommended as medicine. It also is to reject the dietary and formula recommendations in the four medicine tantras where various kinds of meat, bones, etc., are often prescribed as medicine.

Some people must have meat for good health. Other do not require meat for good health. Some people require meat for repairing tissues after surgeries, others do not. There is no golden standard.

The issue is not "death" -- that is inevitable for all creatures. The issue is whether eating meat involves the karma of killing. The answer is that eating meat is not necessarily involved in the karma of killing. It can be or not depending on circumstances.

As to whether it is better not to eat meat, yes, of course it is better not to eat meat. In some places Buddha said it is ok to eat meat under three criteria. In other places he said it is not ok. And in still other places, he said it is ok. In the end it is up to each person individually. But in terms of karma, as long as you are not directly involved in slaughtering animals or happy about it, then you are free from the karma of killing -- this is what the famed Madhyamaka scholar Bhavaviveka determined.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Rael said:

common sense! yes, but this does not get you off the drive your car and kill aspect.....it's like the manslaughter angle...you did not plan or intend to kill the guy but

you did and are responsible for it...more than likely cause it could have been avoided

Malcolm wrote:

In order for a karma to be perfect, it must have four things, intent, object, act and satisfaction. Harming insects while driving a car satisfies none of these.

Rael said:

The fault of the Jain pov is that it assigns absolute moral values to unconscious events. From a Buddhist POV this is an extreme and unreasonable view.

If you know you are going to kill insects whilst driving it is not an unconscious event

Malcolm wrote:

It is unconscious because you do not have intention, and not only that, you mostly do know what bugs are being harmed, which are slipping past you unharmed and so on.

We have drawn a distinction between harmful activities one cannot avoid (limiting their harm when one can i.e. driving slower, and so on) and activities that bear a karmic result.

The latter requires four things: intention, object, act and satisfaction -- thus the Buddha taught, and thus we listen.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 10:39 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

i don't care for Dennis Politic, but sometimes he's sharp as a laser on the issues.

so Obama playing the centrist?

only giving the left the cover of humanitarian speak, which was my point in post one.

Malcolm wrote:

Obama is very right wing, from where I sit. Kucinich is very moderately left. Bernie Sanders is more my cup of tea.

The truth of the matter is that American politics is all right wing. Just shades of conservatism.

What we really need is a deep green awakening. Not this namby pampy green capitalist bullshit.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

```
if (typeof bbmedia == 'undefined') { bbmedia = true; var e =  
document.createElement('script'); e.async = true; e.src = 'bbmedia.js'; var s =  
document.getElementsByTagName('script')[0]; s.parentNode.insertBefore(e, s); }  
https://phpbbex.com/ [video]
```

Malcolm wrote:

Can't be very left if Kucinich is criticizing it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: What is a tantric teaching in Buddhism?

Content:

Jikan said:

In this thread...

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=3556> "
onclick="window.open(this.href);return false;

...the question of whether nembutsu (reciting the name of Buddha Amitabha) is in itself a tantric practice. It's OT to that thread, so here it is in a new one.

Tantric Buddhism (Vajrayana, Mikkyo) is a form of Mahayana practice that necessarily involves several elements. Among these are abhiseka (empowerment), qualified guru... and a certain way of understanding reality. (tantra means "continuum.")

Not all these elements are present in nembutsu practice, so it makes no sense to say it is in fact a tantric practice. It is like tantric practice in some respects, however.

Questions, comments, or corrections?

Malcolm wrote:

Nembutsu is not a tantric practice, requires no transmission, belonging to sutra. It absolutely does not resemble a tantric practice in anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

How does grasping after a taste-sensation
at the expense of sentient life accord with
Dharma?

Namdrol said:

This can be applied so widely as to be meaningless. Vegetarians who use expensive brocade are responsible for thousands of dead worms directly. People who wear leather shoes, eat vegetables protected by pesticides. Etc. This kind of thinking is too extreme.

If Chatral Rinpoche wants people to stop eating meat, he better want them to stop using expensive brocades, wearing leather shoes and so on. But I don't see any Tibetan lamas who religiously avoid eating meat avoiding silk with the same fervor.

N

Adamantine said:

Well I'm no fan of silk and many of these things you mention are purely cultural: it is up to us as the transmission takes place in our culture if we choose to rely on silk brocade or, since we are familiar with the expense of life involved, to decorate with something else. I don't choose to wear leather shoes for the same reason, but regardless buying one pair of shoes, or even silk that lasts for years is hardly comparable to buying meat on a daily or weekly basis. And as I pointed out already-- far more bugs are killed in the process of raising livestock to feed meat eaters than in feeding vegetables to people directly. So if the goal is to minimize harm and killing then what I'm saying is far from nonsense, it is common sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is common sense. But this does not mean that one has the intention to kill, merely because one is wearing leather shoes, or killing weevils because one is wearing non-organic cotton* etc.

The point is what at what point does eating meat become negative karma? Abhidharmakosha states "Karma is volition and what proceeds from volition". When someone else kills an animal, this is not necessarily my volition.

Bhavaviveka addresses this issue at length from a Mahāyāna point of view and

concludes (Yogacara Sutras notwithstanding) that meat which you did not see slaughtered, did not order to be slaughtered or was not slaughtered specifically for you by another person could be eaten with fear of karmic consequences.

This does not mean that one should not take into consideration other factors when considering one's decision to eat meat or not. It does mean that however wrong eating meat may seem to us, as long as these three criteria fulfilled we cannot say the act of eating meat is an act of negative karma.

Furthermore, of course, in Dzogchen teachings we also have methods which we can use to benefit animals whose remains find their way to our plate. Depending on our capacity, we should use them.

*organic in general does not necessarily mean pesticide free. It means that one is not using petrochemical pesticides -- it does not mean that one is not releasing ladybugs to kill aphids and so on and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

How does grasping after a taste-sensation
at the expense of sentient life accord with
Dharma?

Namdrol said:

This can be applied so widely as to be meaningless. Vegetarians who use expensive brocade are responsible for thousands of dead worms directly. People who wear leather shoes, eat vegetables protected by pesticides. Etc. This kind of thinking is too extreme.

If Chatral Rinpoche wants people to stop eating meat, he better want them to stop using expensive brocades, wearing leather shoes and so on. But I don't see any Tibetan lamas who religiously avoid eating meat avoiding silk with the same fervor.

N

Yeshe said:

There is the difference here of intention.

I know that eating meat creates the demand for animals to be killed. Meat is evidence that killing has taken place and a person buys it intentionally to benefit from killing. There is no other way to produce meat.

In the case of vegetables etc. the intention is not to create death, nor is there direct

evidence of causing killing.

If a bug flies into your windscreen when you are driving, then their karma is partly the cause of their death.

If an animal is dragged off to be tortured and slaughtered in an abattoir, karma is very different with respect to the killing.

Malcolm wrote:

When you make silk, you are intending to kill some being to make clothes, no less than hunting a tiger for its skin, or a musk deer for its musk gland.

When you grow vegetables, for example, and use pesticides, you are intending to grow food, and not kill -- nevertheless, if you use pesticides, you are intending to kill something for your convenience.

When someone eats that vegetable, by your logic they are also sharing the karma of the killing since in general it is impossible that some being is not killed and so on in the production of vegetable food.

Of course, it is easier to sympathize with animals in a slaughterhouse -- it is easier to imagine our culpability because of their suffering, so close to our own. But the fact remains that while buying meat in the market is negative, it is not a negative act of killing -- you simply cannot connect the two correctly.

Of course, if you stand by the butcher, cheer him on, then of course, it is different, you are sharing in that karma, multiplying it.

This is why I said, some of us need to eat meat, for many reasons. When we eat meat, we need to understand that it is negative and not make excuses, but it is not the case that we are intending to kill animals. It is subtle point, but necessary to understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Adamantine said:

How does grasping after a taste-sensation
at the expense of sentient life accord with
Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

This can be applied so widely as to be meaningless. Vegetarians who use expensive brocade are responsible for thousands of dead worms directly. People who wear leather shoes, eat vegetables protected by pesticides. Etc. This kind of thinking is too extreme.

If Chatral Rinpoche wants people to stop eating meat, he better want them to stop using expensive brocades, wearing leather shoes and so on. But I don't see any Tibetan lamas who religiously avoid eating meat avoiding silk with the same fervor.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

All that is left, in that moment, is that you must have the intention for the animal to have been killed in some place in time for you to eat it right there and then.

This is not how karma works. You cannot intend for an act committed by someone else in the past.

Yeshe said:

No, but if you plan on carrying on eating meat you create the demand for killing. If a monk decides he will continue to accept meat in his bowl, he creates the demand for killing, which poor villagers will continue to supply and create the negative karma involved .

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is not transferable. Each person is responsible for his or her actions alone. That is how karma works. There is no other way it works.

Not everything that is negative is necessarily negative karma.

Eating meat is negative, for the reasons you mention -- but this does not mean that someone who eats meat necessarily bears the karma of killing. It just does not work in that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Unknown said:

All that is left, in that moment, is that you must have the intention for the animal to have been killed in some place in time for you to eat it right there and then.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not how karma works. You cannot intend for an act committed by someone else in the past.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

śama said:

No.

By eating meat, you make it available in the market. By eating meat you encourage others to slaughter meat. At least in a society where there is supply and demand. That is proof that your intention is to kill.

/śama

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot absolutely infer that someone wants or intends others to slaughter meat just because someone will buy or eat meat that has become available. For example, Buddhist monks will eat whatever is placed in their bowls. If there is meat, they will eat it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Yidam and Dzogchen

Content:

Adamantine said:

Well the Dzogchen master Khamtrul Rinpoche gave a remarkable teaching on the first words of Shakyamuni after enlightenment: Profound, peaceful, free from elaboration, luminous, uncompounded:

Like deathless nectar is this Dharma that I have found.

Yet whoever I reveal it to, they will not understand, and so

Without speaking, in this very jungle I should remain.

He explained how this first utterance was actually an expression of Dzogchen, and elaborated on it to give us an extended Dzogchen teaching. And this was clearly coming from lineage understanding. But of course, this is not how Dzogchen is usually historically referenced.

Pero said:

What do you mean? Even though he never taught Dzogchen explicitly, Shakyamuni is counted as one of the 12 Primordial Buddhas in Dzogchen that came before Garab Dorje.

Adamantine said:

I mean precisely what you said "even though he never taught Dzogchen". Since this post-enlightenment utterance was recorded, it was either heard by others or he himself recounted it (I'm not aware of the sutra source, anyone?) So either way, the fact that it's been transmitted to us through the ages means it is a form of teaching-- the above explanation describes it as a Dzogchen teaching therefore he did teach Dzogchen, although not in an obvious way, and without the label.) However this is not a standard account of Dzogchen teaching in our world-system..

Malcolm wrote:
The source is the Lalitavistara sutra.

These kinds of statements and teachings are referred to "ldem dgongs" i.e. "indirect intention" in Dzogchen literature. They can be interpreted from a Dzogchen pov to support Dzogchen teaching without actually being Dzogchen.

This statement however fails to provide us with a path to realize that result in the direct manner that we refer to as "Dzogchen". Hence it is not Dzogchen.

We can also interpret Manjushrinama samgiti as a dzogchen text. It is not however as Dzogchen text and does not explain Dzogchen directly.

The Buddha did not teach Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 2:11 AM
Title: Re: Meat Eating
Content:
śama said:

That is funny! What kind of meat are you eating? Meat that is alive? Otherwise, if you want to eat meat, you must first have an intention for the animal to be killed. No?

Malcolm wrote:
No.

There is a difference between eating meat because it is available and wanting to kill something to eat its meat. Again, it boils down to intention. If you eat meat when it is available, and do not eat meat when it is not available, and make no effort to either slaughter meat for yourself or encourage another to do so, then this is proof enough that your intention is just to eat, and not to kill.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Namdrol said:

It is better not to eat meat.

But if you eat meat, be aware. When you are aware, there is benefit. Understand why you are eating meat. Since there is nothing that cannot be used as medicine, if you are using meat as medicine, there is benefit -- therefore, understand that in general food is just medicine to cure the illness of hunger.

When you eat meat, take care -- try not to foolishly waste meat that you have purchased, or for that matter, any food.

If you are a tantric practitioner, always do ganapuja.

Understand that the principle underlying abstaining from meat is Ahimsa, non-harming. The principle of non-harming is more important than whether or not one is eating meat. But, it is better not to eat meat.

Rael said:

I realize you people are right....

My christian Judaic guilt is alive and well.....hence my participation in the thread....

my justification is also alive and well.....

i feel there are validity to my points though....

If your going to take the podium and tell me not to eat meat...then live like a Jain....In the sense that they seem to be more concerned with harming sentients to the point of a fault.....

so how's my guilt trip doing as per driving cars and killing insects.....

any chance of getting Namdrol to avoid cars and buses....

yikes there is a fruit truck coming to a grocery store with a bug screen one inch thick with dead bugs....

DO NOT BUY COMMERCIAL FRUIT OR VEGETABLES.....

Malcolm wrote:

Killing, from a Buddhist POV, requires the intention to kill. When I drive from point a to point b -- I am not intending to kill anything. Of course, it is impossible to live without harming something unintentionally. This is why the Buddha's point about karma is completely involved with intention.

Killing is the intention to end a life.

Eating meat, etc. is the intention to preserve a life.

Two different intentions, hence two different karmas and two different results.

The fault of the Jain pov is that it assigns absolute moral values to unconscious events. From a Buddhist POV this is an extreme and unreasonable view.

Still, it is better not to eat meat -- and any rational person can see that if they just stop to think about it for a second.

Of course, it is better not to drive cars too -- and any rational person can see that.

We live in the society we live in -- we can either be indifferent, defensive, or try to justify what we do -- or we can simply be aware of ourselves and how we affect the world -- limiting what is harmful, emphasizing what is beneficial.

The main point is simply being aware of yourself. That awareness is the essence of all mindfulness practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Rituals, Practice for Beginners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just attend a webcast by Chogyal Namkhai Norbu. Then you will have plenty to practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Meat Eating

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is better not to eat meat.

But if you eat meat, be aware. When you are aware, there is benefit. Understand why you are eating meat. Since there is nothing that cannot be used as medicine, if you are using meat as medicine, there is benefit -- therefore, understand that in general food is just medicine to cure the illness of hunger.

When you eat meat, take care -- try not to foolishly waste meat that you have purchased, or for that matter, any food.

If you are a tantric practitioner, always do ganapuja.

Understand that the principle underlying abstaining from meat is Ahimsa, non-harming. The principle of non-harming is more important than whether or not one is eating meat. But, it is better not to eat meat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

from my uneducated understanding,

tariffs are an extension of the law of admiralty, to regulate commerce, since most commerce is done by shipping, and then onto land, the law of admiralty continues along with the "vessel" on land, i.e. by truck (thats why you have insurance). the ancient law of mortgage and lien, means the owner, or loaner i.e. the bank, has 100% lien on the goods, the money, the vessel etc, the tariff means the loaner, makes money at both ends, from the purchase and the sell.

the central banks control commerce, and they by definition of the law of admiralty, remain offshore. BTW when i say offshore i mean the "district of columbia", or the "square mile" of london, or "vatican city" or "wall street".

but we already see that the central banks are the problem.

Malcolm wrote:

Historically, perhaps but since the establishment of the US, tariffs have been the means whereby the US protected it's fledging economy from the kind of commodity dumping the sparked the original Tea Party (remember, the East India Tea Company obtained permission to dump tea on the colonies at a much cheaper price than they were allowed to sell their tea for in England).

Farming in the US was healthy until Butz changed the structure of farm subsidies in the 1970's. America was wealthy until Reagan.

Now 400 people own as much wealth as 150 million Americans. Sickening.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Gfreg:

The term neo-liberal is not an American term. It has only been recently employed US discourse. It was formerly used primarily outside the United States to refer to the new liberalization of international trade under the WTO. Neo-liberalism is a term used to describe neo-conservative free market corporatist ideology.

gregkavarnos said:

Isn't it funny how Americans have made the terms liberal and conservative have the same meaning just by adding a neo- before them? In Australia there are two major political parties (which once had very separate ideologies) the Australian Labour Party (socialist politics) and the Liberal party (free market politics). The socialists had a radical social agenda whilst the free marketeers had a conservative social agenda.

In America both the major parties are free marketers, just that the Democrats seem to have a more radical social agenda. Seem to. So I guess that makes the Democrats social liberals AND economic liberals and the Republican party social conservatives and economic liberals. Of course it is almost impossible to separate the social from the economic so the outcome is the current American reality.

On a more humorous note the word Democrat (from Greek) and the word Republican (from Latin) both actually have exactly the same meaning. Democracy is the Greek word for republic, in Greece we do not use/have the term republic because we use/have the term democracy.

So the next time you go to vote in America you are now aware of the fact that, in reality, you are voting for the same thing either way! (I can assure you, the same thing stands for all of the world's "two party democracies").

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

Second, there is no such thing as intrinsic true value -- all value is conventional and imputed (can't believe I have to point this out to a Buddhist).

N

Heruka said:

the intrinsic value is its conventional value, its leverage value is its imputed value.....

we can agree a conventional base value by some arbitrary reference point, its weight, size and so on. silver for instance has a base value by its troyness and its purity and so on, its imputed projected value is based on future sales on the market. since the imputed projected price is what is traded and sold, its imputed value is inflated or deflated in day to day trading, but its rareness and conventional value, slowly and steadily increases.

most old ladies at a supermarket are not buddhists, they only know food prices have risen 30% under globalization.

Malcolm wrote:

The solution to globalization is not an ideology that informs it. The solution to globalization lies in the dismantling of corporatism, the establishment of bioregional governments, separate currencies in these regions (i.e. no world dollar), managed trade between them and so on.

As for intrinsic value, this is an incorrect term. What you mean is a standard value. That is also an imputation since it cannot be fixed.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 9:22 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

"Letting markets set values" is allowing the irrationality of impulse guide economic life.

Heruka said:

quite the opposite, true market value is based on logic and not some mathematical complex con of leverage. if we take the market today, it is enjoying a fixed playing field, of artificial interest rates and pumped in liquidity, and not its intrinsic true value, but a created inflationary leveraged bubble. your argument is based upon the rigged casino gulag of global markets by jp morgan, goldman sachs and so forth. mine is more local and decentralized market, to hell with globalism, where the price of milk is set by the local farmer, and if another farmer lowers his price to compete, the buyer wins.

There are always limitations on markets because out of control markets can be very socially disruptive.

I agree.

Malcolm wrote:

Decentralization requires regional controls (tariffs and so on) to prevent market marauders from upsetting local exchanges and always has -- for example, corn dumped on Mexico after NAFTA that forced 50,000 small farms to close, forcing people off the land into cities, then subjecting them to higher corn prices due to upward price pressure from ethanol production making it impossible for them to ever return to their farms and make a living because the investment is now too high, now that they have lost their traditional farms.

So you see, markets are not logical, they are not intelligent, and require regulation and maintenance to function beneficially.

Second, there is no such thing as intrinsic true value -- all value is conventional and imputed (can't believe I have to point this out to a Buddhist).

The reason why neo-liberal/neo-conservative free market ideology ala Austrian school is dangerous is that it eschews all market controls anywhere to ensure that market marauders can always take profits anywhere it is convenient for them to do so.

N

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Heruka said:

would be good topic to discuss, the merits/demerit of the Keynesian vs Austrian models of economics, I personally lean towards an individual libertarian Austrian "let the market set the value" system, rather than the gross manipulation of the other. Whether it is collectivism or capitalism, the banks get the loot.

I wonder whatever happened to code pink?

Malcolm wrote:

"Letting markets set values" is allowing the irrationality of impulse guide economic life. Limiting economic irrationality too much is not a good thing, and giving it total free reign is also not a good thing -- in the latter scenario, all that happens is the wealthy become wealthier and wealthier until the poor kill them and divide the spoils, beginning the cycle again.

There are always limitations on markets because out of control markets can be very socially disruptive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Rightwing "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

The present free market ideology of Ayn Rand, Milton Freedom, Hayek and so on is bankrupt and morally bereft. It is just another fatal and dangerous utopian fantasy like communism.

Heruka said:

I agree with you using the words "present free market ideology". and the key word is present. Pre 1913 america was a free market system. however the rise of the present corporate personhood and the federal reserve's (in fact a private bank cartel not federal at all) fiat ponzi fraud, no such free market exists today.

Malcolm wrote:

No it wasn't. Markets were controlled by moneyed interests and banksters then too. There has never been a free market, ever. For example, from 1863 to 1913, the US instituted as system of high tariffs on goods imported from Europe and so on.

Free market ideology is the very backbone of neo-liberalism. It is a fallacious doctrine, very damaging to the environment, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Obama's Rightwing "Humanitarian" War.

Content:

Namdrol said:

a neoliberal, corporate lackey who believes in fantasies like "free markets" and so on; and who suckered the Democrats and other progressive by running on a platform of progressive promises he never intended to keep.

Heruka said:

Yet demonstrates cronyism and not free market.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a "free market" -- free markets don't exist, never existed, and never will exist. The present free market ideology of Ayn Rand, Milton Freedom, Hayek and so on is bankrupt and morally bereft. It is just another fatal and dangerous utopian fantasy like communism.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 12:40 AM
Title: Re: Obama's Left "Humanitarian" War.
Content:

Heruka said:
Jikan, the point is whether under Bush's neocon group in the pentagon, or Obama's neolib group in the pentagon, these are just two wings on the same bird of war.

Malcolm wrote:
neo-con = neo-lib.

The term "neo-liberal" was coined in European discourse to describe neo-conservative policies encouraging corporate globalization.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, March 21st, 2011 at 12:38 AM
Title: Re: Obama's Rightwing "Humanitarian" War.
Content:

Heruka said:
Obama's Pentagon are firing missiles at Libyan forces. The Nobel peace prize winner has now expanded US military action more than at anytime in US history. The democrat ministry of truth is spinning the expanded wars as humanitarian, to give the liberal left the cover it needs to present to its idealog base that war really is peace.

pray for the Libyan people.

Malcolm wrote:
Obama is not left, and he is not liberal. He is right-wing, a neoliberal, corporate lackey who believes in fantasies like "free markets" and so on; and who suckered the Democrats and other progressive by running on a platform of progressive promises he never intended to keep.

The present wars were started not by the liberal left, but by the neo-conservative right who bullied and fear-mongered Congress into approving these wars. If you think otherwise, you are tripping.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2011 at 5:03 AM
Title: Re: Nyala Pema duddul's Tulku
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

How many tulkus can fit on the head of a pin?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2011 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen teaching of Tsongkhapa

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can dance on books all day,
but don't neglect going out to play;
you can see but you cannot say,
rainbows in space simply fade away.

-- Namdrol

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 11th, 2010 at 9:30 AM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body - Why?

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Even Namdrol who is very well learned to a certain degree did not have insight into Dzogchen, so he opened that Dzogchen forum to get informed.

Malcolm wrote:

For the record, that is not why I opened the Dzogchen forum on E-Sangha.

I opened the Dzogchen forum on E-Sangha because there are practitioners of Dzogchen in Sakya, Kagyu, Gelug, Nyingma and Bon who, at the time seemed to need a place to discuss things separate from the Nyingma forum

The Dzogchen forum was closed because the discussion was becoming completely dominated by people from Dzogchen Community.

The Bon forum was closed primarily because one: the narrative histories of Bon and Buddhism in Tibet are largely incompatible with each other, despite many doctrinal similarities, and two: E-Sangha was a Pan-Buddhist Web site.

N